

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XXIII

MAY, 1928

NUMBER 8

CAN WE TEACH LATIN PROSE STYLE?

By GILBERT NORWOOD
University College, Toronto

Some years ago, when I was professor of Greek in a British university and was called upon in an emergency to teach Latin for a time, I found (as no doubt we all do) that even the ablest students rarely go beyond grammatical accuracy in Latin prose composition. They might admire and enjoy the style of Cicero, Livy, or Tacitus, and endeavor to illumine their own work with some gleam of that brilliance; but what they produced was pallid, dull, empty of artistic merit. It seemed to me that, whichever of those masters was theoretically the most excellent, for my pupils Livy was the most useful (or the easiest) model, being more colored than Cicero, less knotty than Tacitus. But concentration upon Livy, even the memorization of lengthy passages, produced little result. Some method was needed which would focus attention upon his style, and nothing but his style; some means whereby the fingers could feel and follow the crisp edges of his Latinity itself.

The plan which I adopted brought about an immediate and very notable improvement. Those who had shown no power at all now wrote what read like genuine Latin, and some produced brilliant work. Other teachers, therefore, may be interested to read the details. First I selected a sentence of Livy which exhibited his manner briefly and plainly. Then I translated it into English as exact, and also as idiomatic, as I could. This latter was set before

my students, and therewith the original Latin, from which however one word was omitted, a word which formed the syntactical, and the stylistic, keystone of the sentence. This word the pupil was to supply. He knew the kind of word required to make sense: could he find what word Livy actually employed? Thus:

Let those who benefit by war face its perils,
Penes eosdem pericula sint belli penes quos sunt ———.

Some wrote *bona*. Abler students suggested *commoda* (with which indeed many of us would be satisfied). But when they found that Livy himself wrote *praemia*, the force and color of the word were pressed home upon them, by the inferiority of their own attempts, with a vigor which a dozen hours of reading would not have compassed. They never forgot *praemia*. Progress was rapid and delightful. When I gave them

The commissariat was now better organized,
Commeatus intentiore quam antea ——— *cura*,

at least one actually found the original *subvehi*, which is surely remarkable testimony to the value of this method.

The reader may perhaps wish to consider a few other examples and supply for himself the necessary single word in each place:

1. Those by whose wounds and toil it has been won, ought to possess it,
Verum esse habere eos, quorum sanguine ac ——— *partus sit.*
2. Escape was the one thought that filled all minds,
Nemo ullius nisi fugae ———.
3. He recognized his mother standing between his wife and his children,
Cognoverat matrem suam inter ——— *nepotesque stantem.*
4. I insist on a straightforward answer,
Mittere ——— *iubeo.*
5. Brutus saw that the onslaught was directed against himself,
Sensit in se ——— *Brutus.*
6. The report penetrates to every corner of Rome,
 ——— *tota urbe rumor.*
7. War was unexpectedly postponed,
Bellum spe omnium ——— *fuit.*

8. A dismal winter was followed by a trying and unhealthy summer,
Tristem hiemem gravis pestilensque aestas ———.
9. It was impossible to get the full number of tribunes,
Tribunorum plebis numerus ——— *nequii*.
10. Every man among them would have made an excellent general,
Eorum neminem ducem ———.
11. The fall of Velitrae (was) only a question of time,
Velitrarum obsidio, ——— *magis res exitus quam dubii*.
12. Lapse of time makes certainty impossible,
Certam ——— *vetustas fidem*.
13. The hostility of Veii was a nuisance rather than a menace,
Veiens hostis ——— *magis erat quam gravis*.
14. This sudden development rendered the consul dumb with amazement,
Consuli tam novae rei ac subitae admiratio ——— *vocem*.

TANKS AND ROMAN WARFARE

By LESTER K. BORN
Princeton University

Military practices in the Great War have furnished several interesting comparisons with Roman antiquity. One which thus far has received but little notice appears in the use of tanks by modern military science, a practice which finds its counterpart in the employment of elephants by the ancients.¹ The similarities in purpose and technique in the two cases are noteworthy. Among the outstanding characteristics which have made the modern tank useful as an instrument of warfare are those of protection, mobility, force, and bulk, together with the psychological effect produced upon human beings. These same characteristics found in the elephant are suggested by Lucan when he says:²

Thus Afric elephant, when hunters press,
By shrug of hide shakes off the puny dart
Which finds a hold, while from his rugged bulk
Some fall in shivers; and his vital parts
Are safe within; and though the spears are thick
Upon the beast, none reach the fount of blood.

The psychological effect of the tank when it first appeared was tremendous, because of its unusual appearance. This same element of novelty was understood and taken advantage of by the ancient commanders. The Romans first became acquainted with this feature of warfare when Pyrrhus brought his elephants into Italy. The effect is described with characteristic euphemy.³ "Valerius

¹ The comparison of elephants in ancient military operations to our modern tank is not an untouched field, but it has only been casually treated, so far as I know. Armandi in his *Histoire Militaire des Éléphants* has a very complete work, but it was written before the invention of tanks.

² Lucan, *Phars.* vi. 208-213.

³ Livy *Ep.* 13. Cf. also Justin. xviii. 1. 4-7; Flor. i. 18. 8, and iii. 2. 5; Eutrop. ii. 11; Plut. *Pyrrhus* 17.3; and *Bell. Afr.* 19, 43, 70.

Laevinus, the consul, made little headway in the battle against Pyrrhus, because his soldiers were demoralized by the appearance of the elephants, which they had never seen before." Their next experience with "tanks" was in the wars with Hannibal, who, in the instance here cited, advanced his "tanks" to the assaulting position for the decisive moment of the attack. The elephants "threw the troops into confusion and broke their ranks and, treading some under foot and dispersing some who were around them by the alarm they created, made an opening in one part of the Roman line." ⁴ In 153 B.C. the Romans employed these same principles against the Numantines in Spain.⁵

Next to the element of surprise, perhaps the most outstanding and most important feature of the tanks is their crushing power and their force. This was also true of the elephants. On one occasion in the Punic War, Fulvius, the Roman general, did not have time to prepare the usual carefully fortified camp, but merely threw up earthwork embankments and hastily dug ditches with occasional breaks in them. This Hannibal observed and ordered his elephants, followed by supporting troops, to break through these open spaces and get over the earthworks in any way that they could. This was accomplished, to the great consternation of the Roman garrison.⁶

In narrating the defeat of Regulus in the First Punic War, Polybius gives us the following important account of the use of elephants to clinch a victory.⁷ "The fortune of the several divisions of the infantry was various. Those stationed on the left wing — partly because they could avoid the elephants and partly because they thought contemptuously of the mercenaries — charged the right wing of the Carthaginians, succeeded in driving them from their ground, and pursued them as far as their entrenchment.

⁴ Livy xxvii. 14. Cf. Polyb. i. 39, where the report of one disastrous battle had such an effect on the morale that "during two years running after that time . . . they never plucked up courage to begin an attack . . . all because of their fear of an elephant charge"; and *id.*, i. 74 and iii. 53.

⁵ App. *Span. War* 46. Cf. App. *Civ. War* ii. 96; *Bell. Afr.* 19.

⁶ App. *Hann.* 41. Cf. Plut. *Pyrrhus* 21. 5-7.

⁷ Polyb. i. 34.

Those stationed in front of the elephants were less fortunate. The maniples in front were thrown into utter confusion by the crushing weight of the animals: knocked down and trampled upon by them, they perished in heaps upon the field; yet owing to the great depth of the main body it remained unbroken for a time. But it was not for long. . . . Most of the Romans were trampled to death by the elephants; the rest were shot down in their ranks by the numerous cavalry. . . ."

At this point it is well to say that, like its modern counterpart, the elephant was exceedingly vulnerable under certain conditions. In the battle between Fulvius and Hannibal just referred to above, the elephants penetrated into the very heart of the Roman camp, which was their undoing; for, crowded together into a narrow space without room to maneuver, and entangled in the wreckage of the tents and huts, they were a ready target for a relentless fire at close range. Livy tells us that in one instance an attack that was well in favor of the Carthaginians was turned the other way by a concerted "anti-tank" attack⁸ that was hastily organized by a Roman officer. He took his handful of men, opened a scathing fire at close range on the elephants, and stopped them. This so turned the tide that the enemy started to withdraw.⁹

Just as a platoon of tanks is assigned in support of an assault battalion in our modern warfare, so a comparable assignment was given the elephants in Roman days. According to Polybius¹⁰ the Carthaginian army consisted of 12,000 infantry, 4,000 cavalry, and nearly 100 elephants. This would give a proportion of a little better than 1:150. Plutarch gives us the details of Pyrrhus' army. The relation of "tanks" to infantry there more nearly approaches our proportionate arrangement. Pyrrhus is said to have had 20 elephants, 3,000 cavalry, 20,000 infantry, 2,000 archers, and 500 slingers.¹¹ Hannibal in his famous march over the Alps is said

⁸ Cf. also Plut. *Pyrrhus* 45.3-5.

⁹ Livy xxvii. 14.

¹⁰ Polyb. i. 32. We must not forget to accept all figures and estimates in the ancient historians *cum grano salis*, yet for comparison they are interesting.

¹¹ Plut. *Pyrrhus* 15. 1.

to have had in his army 80,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry, and 37 elephants.¹²

The normal assignment of the elephants was to a position in front of the front line — separated by rather wide intervals — and followed close behind with a strong wave of the best infantry. For example, Livy tells us that “there was a body of 16,000 troops . . . divided in the leading ranks into ten sections. These were separated by two elephants placed between them. The line of soldiers was 32 ranks in depth. This was the main strength of the army, and it presented a formidable appearance . . . with the elephants towering so high above the soldiers. They were of huge bulk, and . . . the towers fixed upon their backs, with four men standing on each tower, besides the drivers of the beasts, gave them a terrific appearance. . . .”¹³ The things to be noted here especially are the close support of the infantry and the great depth which is necessary for the successful completion of a penetrating movement.

Another instance is told by Polybius.¹⁴ He is describing the Carthaginian army and its battle order. “[Xanthippus] ordered out the elephants and placed them in a single line in front of the whole army. The heavy phalanx of the Carthaginians he stationed at a moderate interval in the rear of these. The mercenaries . . . he placed with cavalry on both wings.” In another battle — a sort of meeting engagement — the general Hanno sent out a cavalry screen well in advance, and then placed his “tanks” just ahead of his heavy shock troops.¹⁵ Nearly the same order was employed in the battle of the Metaurus.¹⁶

The author of the *Bellum Africanum*¹⁷ tells of an instance where Caesar had advanced with his troops in the usual order: cavalry, elephants, and infantry. Scipio, however, who com-

¹² Eutrop. iii. 8.

¹³ Livy xxxvii. 40. Cf. also App. *Syrian War* 32. The establishment of the five men on each beast would in this instance liken them to the “heavy tank.”

¹⁴ Polyb. i. 33.

¹⁵ Polyb. i. 19.

¹⁶ Polyb. xi. 1. Cf. also Livy xxxi. 36; Polyb. i. 78; *Bell. Afr.* 30.

¹⁷ *Bell. Afr.* 41.

manded the opposing forces, placed his elephants on the flanks. Unfortunately the actual attack never took place, and we have no way of knowing the outcome of this "counter-tank" action. However, we do have several other cases where the elephants were employed from a general flank position. In the battle of the Trebia, the Carthaginians placed their elephants in the front but near the end of the lines, and their cavalry on the very flanks. Together the effect was a smashing one and turned the Roman flanks.¹⁸

In modern warfare a great deal depends upon the skill, resourcefulness, and reliability of the tank driver, and the proper maneuver of his tank. So, in ancient times, the effective training of the elephants was essential to success. "Scipio made use of the following means of training his elephants. He drew up two parties in order of battle: one of slingers, who were to act as enemies and discharge small stones against the elephants; and fronting them, the elephants themselves in one line, with his whole army behind them in battle array, so that, when the enemy by their discharge of stones had frightened the elephants and forced them to turn upon their own men, they might make them again face the enemy by the volley of stones from the army behind them."¹⁹

Another point of similarity between these two auxiliary arms is their difficulty of maneuver outside of the actual battle area. When Hannibal crossed the Rhone his greatest difficulty was the transportation of the elephants.²⁰ His method, if we may credit Polybius, was both ingenious and effective. He built a pontoon wharf, covered with earth, out into the river for about half its width, and to the end he fastened two separate rafts on which he ferried the elephants across.²¹ When Claudius sent his expedition to Britain, he ordered some elephants to accompany it.²² Spaulding's pertinent remark was written with a sympathetic understand-

¹⁸ Polyb. iii. 74. Cf. *Bell. Afr.* 59; and Flor. ii, 8, 16.

¹⁹ *Bell. Afr.* 27. Cf. Polyb. i. 38.

²⁰ Polyb. iii. 42.

²¹ Polyb. iii. 46.

²² Dio Cassius ix. 21.

ing: "The private comments of his [Claudius'] transport officers when directed to move such huge beasts from Italy to Gaul must have been worth hearing."²³ Hannibal's difficulties in crossing the Alps are well known.²⁴

Like its modern "descendant" the elephant found the marsh an almost complete barrier.²⁵

As the modern commander who orders a tank attack must first consider the terrain over which the troops will maneuver, so the ancient leaders took this matter under advisement.²⁶ The terrain formed a big factor in Pyrrhus' estimate of the situation for the battle of Asculum, for there "he was forced into regions where his cavalry could not operate, and upon a river with swift current and wooded banks, so that his elephants could not charge and engage the enemy's phalanx. . . . But on the next day, designing to fight the battle on level ground, and to bring his elephants to bear on the ranks of the enemy, Pyrrhus occupied betimes the unfavorable parts of the field with a detachment of his troops; then he put great numbers of slingers and archers in the spaces between the elephants and led his forces to the attack in dense array and with mighty impetus. So the Romans . . . after a long time began to be driven back at the point where Pyrrhus was pressing hard upon his opponents; but the greatest havoc was wrought by the furious strength of the elephants, since the valor of the Romans was of no avail in fighting them, but they felt that they must yield before them as before an onrushing billow or a crashing earthquake. . . ." ²⁷

So far we have looked at these matters only from the point of view of the aggressor. During the African War, while Caesar was preparing for the battle that was imminent, Scipio sent over two spies to ascertain his plans and "to discover what ditches and traps [Caesar] had prepared for the elephants, and how he in-

²³ Spaulding et al.: *Warfare*, 208.

²⁴ Polyb. iii. 55.

²⁵ Polyb. iii. 79.

²⁶ Polyb. i. 30, i. 32, i. 84. Cf. "Tank Driving," *Training Regulation* (USA) 420-280, sec. VI, 21.

²⁷ Plut. *Pyrrhus* 21. 5-7.

tended to oppose those animals. . . ." ²⁸ From this it is clear that "tank traps" were relied upon in defense against tanks in those days just as they are now. Another example — to go back a bit — in anti-tank defense, is where the Roman general Caecilius placed special troops out in advance of his main defense, with the one purpose of stopping the tank attack: "No sooner had the Carthaginians got their elephants and men across [the pass to Panormus], than Caecilius began to send out his light-armed troops to harass them, until he had forced them to get their whole army in fighting order. When he saw that everything was happening as he designed it, he placed some of his light troops to line the wall and the moat, with instructions that if the elephants came within range they should pour volleys of their missiles upon them; but that whenever they felt themselves being forced from their ground by them, they should retreat into the moat, rush out of it again, and hurl darts at the elephants which happened to be nearest. At the same time he gave orders to the armorers in the market place to carry the missiles and heap them up outside at the foot of the wall. . . . The officers in charge of the elephants . . . charged the advanced skirmishers of the enemy, routed them with ease, and pursued them up to the moat. But no sooner did the elephants come to close quarters than they were wounded by the archers on the wall and overwhelmed by volleys of pila and javelins which poured thick and fast upon them from the men stationed on the outer edge of the moat and who had not yet been engaged. . . . When Caecilius saw this he led out his men with promptitude. . . . Of the elephants he captured ten along with their Indian riders; the rest, which had thrown their Indians, he managed to drive into a herd after the battle, and secured every one of them." ²⁹ The result of all this was just what might have been expected. By overcoming this new and strange attacking force the Roman morale was greatly raised and new vigor instilled in the army.³⁰

²⁸ *Bell. Afr.* 35.

²⁹ *Polyb.* i. 40.

³⁰ *Polyb.* i. 41.

The moral effect on the supporting troops when the tanks are disabled is depressing and may even be sufficient to stop the advance for a time.³¹ Scipio's provisions for withstanding a tank attack initiated by Hannibal are well worth noting in detail: "Scipio drew up his infantry, like those of Hannibal, in three lines, and placed all his cohorts in column so that the cavalry might easily pass between them. In front of each cohort he stationed men armed with stakes about two cubits long, mostly shod with iron, to throw at the oncoming elephants by hand, like catapult bolts. He ordered these and other foot soldiers to avoid the impetus of these beasts and to run round and continually hurl javelins at them, and to get near them and hamstring them whenever they could. . . . The Italian horse . . . he placed in the extreme rear, ready to charge through the intervals of the foot soldiers when the latter should have checked the first onset of the elephants. To each horseman was assigned an attendant with plenty of darts with which to ward off the attack of these beasts. . . ." ³² This calls to mind the anti-tank rifle which the Germans developed during the war, the 50 calibre machine gun just recently perfected by our own army, and the 37 mm gun.

Even more detailed, and yet different, is the preparation of Caesar to meet any future tank attacks that might be launched against him. During the African War he was beset with a series of attacks in which elephants participated. His solution of the difficulty was a good one. He sent to Italy for some elephants so that his men could become accustomed to them by association and understanding, and thereby learn their possibilities, limitations, and vulnerability. This latter necessitated detailed instructions in the armament of the elephant, so that his soldiers would know where to train their weapons in order to score a direct hit. He also trained his cavalry and their horses to become used to these beasts and to attack them with blunted darts in combat exercises.³³

In closing I should like to mention one custom of the ancients

³¹ *Bell. Afr.* 83. Cf. *Flor.* i. 13. 12.

³² *App. Punic War* 41. Cf. *id.*, 43. For a counter-attack against tanks see *Plut. Pyrrhus* 25. 3-5; and also *Livy* xxvii. 14; *id.*, *Ep.* 13; *Bell. Afr.* 83.

³³ *Bell. Afr.* 72.

which has persisted to the present day. In the battle of Thapsus, Caesar was confronted by Scipio with a large army reinforced by a number of elephants. Caesar's men were exceedingly nervous because of the presence of the elephants. Finally "the fifth legion begged to be pitted against the elephants, and it overcame them valiantly. From that day to the present, this legion has borne the figure of an elephant on its standards."³⁴

The extent, if any, to which the use of elephants may have served as a basis for the development of modern tank warfare would be an interesting subject for speculation. I have tried merely to point out some of the numerous similarities existing between the two, in offensive and defensive action. The same characteristics which make the mechanical device valuable today were found in its living counterpart two thousand years ago: impenetrability by ordinary weapons, the power of crushing all in its path, mobility and ease in covering rough ground, and bulk that is demoralizing to those attacked. Similar, too, are the limitations in both cases. Marshes, rivers, and mountains have proved barriers to both, and even under normal conditions great skill is required for successful maneuvering. Both devices have been used to greatest advantage at the head of a concentrated infantry attack; and both necessitate special measures of defense. Perhaps the most important point of all is the effect both elephants and tanks have had upon the morale of the supporting and the opposing troops.

³⁴ App. *Civ. War* ii. 96.

SOME ANCIENT MANIFESTATIONS OF THE RELIGIOUS IMPULSE¹

By HUBERT MCNEILL POTEAT
Wake Forest College

There is no field, I think, which offers the student richer dividends of satisfaction and inspiration in return for the investment of time and diligence than the history of religion. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss so vast a theme, but rather to point out certain types of religious belief which were widely held in ancient times and which, in point of fact, are by no means extinct even in this advanced period. The only originality to which I may possibly lay claim is to be found in the assembling of several of these types in the space of a brief article — so brief, indeed, as to preclude a really adequate discussion of any one of them.

It is a commonplace of anthropology that, with two or three negligible exceptions, all races of men in all times have bowed down and worshiped; not always worthily, but usually in sincerity. A certain wise Frenchman has truly said that man is incurably religious. Psychologically, then, all religions are identical, since they spring from a universal need. But conceptions of deity have varied all but incredibly and have assumed an infinity of forms. It will be observed that some of the forms discussed herein are not sharply distinct from one another. In reality, the more one studies the religions of mankind, the more clearly one perceives that there is hardly to be found a single widespread form of religious belief which has not been influenced in some degree by other and sometimes vastly different faiths and creeds.

¹ Read at the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Southern Section of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Washington and Lee University, April 28-30, 1927.

It is obviously impossible to enter upon even the briefest discussion of any considerable number of manifestations of the religious impulse. I shall, therefore, present nine, and in bare outline.

First, *Anthropomorphism*. It is, I think, unquestionably true that of all the heresies which have held sway over the minds and hearts of men, anthropomorphism is at once the most ancient, the most popular, and the most fatal. It has appeared in multifarious forms among all races of all periods, and its power is still mighty among large sections of the inhabitants of this planet.

St. Paul's view of it may be found in his Epistle to the Romans 1:20-25; and, indeed, idolatry is its most widespread type. The untutored savage, groping in darkness after some worthy object of worship, hits upon a likeness of himself, magnified, perhaps, or hideously distorted, the better to inspire terror. He is intellectually incapable of bowing down to the invisible: his gods must be at hand — within the sight of his eyes and the touch of his fingers.

As civilization advances we find statues and images — still in human form — worshiped, not as gods and goddesses, but as representations of the divine ones who appear in person only rarely. The popular religion of Greece and Rome is a case in point. The immortal gods dwelt on Mt. Olympus, or in favorite islands and forests and valleys, and the people did them reverence through their images in the temples. But the images were thought to be more or less faithful portraits of the gods, who were simply men and women gifted with the ability to fly through the air and, as Horace puts it, "knowing not the chill of death." Moreover, no student of Homer and Vergil needs to be reminded that the deities of ancient Greece and Rome mingled freely with men, not always invisibly, and were moved by envy, lust, ambition, and rage, as men were, but in a far greater degree.

It should be noted, in passing, that these childish imaginings were not for a moment accepted by the philosophers and sages of any ancient nation. Socrates, Plato, Cicero, Zoroaster, Confucius, no more subscribed to the popular superstitions of their respective

periods than we do. For example, we read in the *Tusculan Disputations*: "I do not believe that the gods delight in ambrosia or nectar, or in the cup of eternal youth, nor do I credit Homer when he babbles of Ganymede, carried off to the skies on account of his beauty, to serve drinks to Jove. Homer, in short, invented all this and transferred human attributes to the gods. I should prefer to implant divine attributes in ourselves."

Indeed, it may be said that there has always been and is now a conception of deity cherished by the wise and enlightened which differs very widely from that held by the ignorant masses.

During the later years of the fourth century B.C. a certain Euhemerus propounded the theory that the numerous divinities who were said to reign from Mt. Olympus were, in reality, men who, in some past age, had been mighty warriors or great benefactors of mankind and after their death were worshiped by the people out of gratitude. It is interesting to find a notion substantially the same among certain Australian tribes of our own time. An eminent scientist tells us that they worship "magnified, undying men who lived long on earth and then went to their own place, whence they watch men and their conduct, but take little part in their affairs."

Anthropomorphism is widely prevalent today among the ignorant and superstitious. No person who has attended certain types of "camp-meeting" will ask proof of this statement. The deity is vociferously pictured as a big man with a long beard, a fearful frown, and an unerring aim with thunderbolts. It is disheartening, moreover, to find such puerile ideas present in the minds of many persons who ought to know better. I read not long ago of a popular novelist who dared God to kill him as a sort of sporting proposition. And I have heard on unimpeachable authority that certain itinerant evangelists inform business men in their audiences that if they insist upon keeping their stores open during the hour of morning service, Almighty God will strike them dead. Anthropomorphism? Certainly; and impudent and hideous blasphemy, as well.

It should be remarked, in closing this portion of the discussion,

that many instances of anthropomorphism in the Bible are obviously figurative. For example, "The Lord is a mighty man of war," "The Lord hath made bare his holy arm," "Behold, the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear Him," and the like.

Let us turn now to the second manifestation of the religious impulse, *Theriomorphism* or *Zoötheism*, the worship of deity in animal form. One thinks immediately of the religion of ancient Egypt, with its menagerie of horrible beast-gods — Thoth, Anubis, Bast, Set, Apis, and the rest. Apis, indeed, made such a lasting impression upon the Children of Irsael, during their sojourn in Egypt, that, while Moses was receiving the Law on Mt. Sinai, they compelled Aaron to make them a golden image of that deity and fell down and adored it, to the horror of Moses.

One of the most widespread forms of theriomorphism is totemism — the grouping of families and clans and tribes around some central object of worship, which is usually set up on a pole and is in most cases an animal. The totem poles of the far North, with their grotesque and hideous carvings of impossible beasts, are to be seen in any of our large museums.

Among the American Indians the influence of totemism has always been wide and profound. I paraphrase here a passage from one of the leading authorities on Indian lore. The Red Man, brought into constant contact with the animals of the forest and prairie, observed that they possessed greater cunning than himself, that their hunting instinct was much more sure, that they seldom suffered from lack of provisions, that they were more swift of foot. In short, he considered them to be his superiors in those faculties which he most coveted and admired. The fox was proverbial for craft, the wildcat for stealth, the bear for stupidity, the owl for cryptic wisdom, the deer for swiftness. In each of these attributes the several animals to which they belonged appeared to the savage as more gifted than himself, and so deeply was he influenced by this seeming superiority that if he coveted a certain quality he would place himself under the protection of the animal or bird which symbolized it. Again, if a tribe or clan possessed any special characteristic, such as fierce-

ness or cunning, it was usually called by its neighbors after the bird or beast which symbolized its character, or it might even bestow such an appellation upon itself. After the lapse of a few generations the members of a tribe would regard the animal whose qualities they were supposed to possess as their direct ancestor (thereby becoming, of course, frightful heretics), and so would consider that all the members of his species were their blood relations.

I may add that this writer goes so far as to suggest that the owl which accompanied Pallas Athene was merely a survival of an earlier totemic personification. And a friend and former student of mine informed me a short time ago that he had recently heard a competent scholar advance the theory that such epithets as *βοῶπις* and *γλανῶπις* were of theriomorphic, or totemic, origin.

I read, not long ago, certain curious details of totemic theory and practice among the Australian Bushmen. It appears that they bow in deepest reverence before Wallunqua — a fearsome creature, half man and half snake, and thirty miles long. At his worship, the orthodox build a mound of sand fifteen feet long, shaped like an overturned canoe and rendered smooth by the pouring of water over it. Then a black, wavy line is painted around the edge of the mound to represent Wallunqua. This line is next gently and reverently brushed with twigs until it disappears; whereupon the worshipers depart, only to sneak up to the mound after night-fall and savagely hack it to pieces. These enlightened Bushmen live under a matriarchate, and the family names of the women are the names of animals or plants, that is to say, of the totems of the family. The most popular are the frog, the kangaroo, the emu, the wildcat, the gum tree, the lizard, the beetle, and the snake. No man may marry a girl whose totem is the same as his mother's.

It is interesting and instructive to compare with these particulars the deep reverence paid by the worshipers of Aesculapius to serpents, which were regarded as living symbols of renovation and of the renewal of life. Moreover, in ancient Egypt the serpent figured largely in religious symbology.

Among many ancient nations animals and birds were worshiped, not as gods, but as the confidants of the gods, or as incarnations of the Divine spirit. Tacitus informs us that the Germans were in the habit of "making trial of the prophecies and the warnings of horses," which were kept at public expense in groves and forests, were not permitted to work, and were driven in sacred chariots while the king or priest walked at their heads and "listened to their whinnings and neighings."

The incredible Roman practice of watching the flight of birds and peering at the viscera of slain sheep, in the belief that the will of the gods would thus be ascertained, is, of course, another case in point. Livy's charming tale, with which you are all familiar, about the means by which the gods pointed out Romulus as their choice for the honorable distinction of founder of the city of Rome, supplies a further illustration.

Apis has already been mentioned. He differed from the other theriomorphic gods of ancient Egypt in being regarded as the temporary incarnation of the deity of fecundity. The bull which represented the god must possess certain very particular markings, and such animals were not always to be found. When one appeared, it was ecstatically hailed by the populace, pastured and groomed and pampered most lavishly, and loudly bewailed at death. The sacred bull appears also in Mithraism, that noble and beautiful religion of the ancient Persians which so stubbornly resisted the onward march of Christianity.

There are some ethnologists who insist that the charming beast fables, found among all peoples, of all periods of history, are of theriomorphic, or zoötheistic, origin. For example, Joel Chandler Harris, author of the Uncle Remus stories, explains the invariable supremacy of Brer Rabbit in his tales by remarking that the rabbit was "the great central figure and wonder-worker of African mythology."

It may as well be said, by way of concluding this section, that theriomorphism still has its adherents among the so-called educated classes. There are many persons who shudder with fear at the long-drawn howl of a dog in the dead of night; who re-

gard the sedate march of a black cat across the road in front of them as a most evil omen; and who, probably without knowing it, pay tribute to sound Roman tradition in investing with sundry unholy implications the furtive plaints of flitting *striges*.

We come now to *Fetichism*, a widespread form of semi-religious observance which has existed in amicable association with practically every type of religion, ancient and modern. The fetich is, in brief, a mascot, or lucky piece; and fetichism may be defined as a belief in the supernatural powers and influence of certain material objects. These objects, even if one looks only casually into the matter, will be found to represent an amazing variety, ranging from the gruesome equipment of the savage witch-doctor to the swastika watch charm of the up-to-date American.

Among uncivilized races the fetich is watched over and pampered and propitiated by its owner only as long as it brings him prosperity and good fortune. But if the rains fail to appear, or if his wives prove unfaithful, or if his enemy flourishes, it is cast forth with contumely and curses. The notion seems to be that the fetich is the temporary abode of an imprisoned and subservient spirit, which, if its beneficent ministries are long enough continued, may ultimately be elevated by its proud possessor to the dignity of godhead.

The North American Indian has been referred to in the preceding section. Were I merely to enumerate the fetiches held in high repute by him, this paper would be prolonged beyond endurance. I mention only one — for its classical flavor. Among the Apaches, one of the most potent fetiches is lightning-riven wood. Pieces of such wood are shaved thin, carved into a rough resemblance to the human figure, and marked with lines to represent the lightning.

I think the most interesting example of fetichism among the Greeks and Romans was the Palladium — that magic statue of Pallas which, during the reign of Ilus, descended precipitately but benignly into Troy, where it was zealously and successfully guarded until a certain fatal night during which the wily Ulysses

and the mighty Diomed filched it from its sacred precincts, and the proud city of Priam began to totter toward its doom.

The Roman child received, on the *dies lustricus*, not only his praenomen, but a choice lot of all sorts of trinkets and ornaments, called collectively *crepundia*, and worn on a string around the neck. The *crepundia* was the ancient equivalent of the modern infant's rattle, but it (or they, for the word, of course, is plural) discharged, in addition, a function of vastly higher importance, to wit, the protection of the child against *fascinatio* — the evil eye.

Not content, however, with this congeries of magical instruments, the Roman paterfamilias bedecked his young hopefuls with yet another potent fetich — the *bullā* — which was constructed of two concave pieces of gold (if he could afford it), fastened together by a spring and containing an amulet which materially assisted the *crepundia* in the serious business of defense against the nefarious oglings of the wicked. Many other particulars will doubtless suggest themselves to you, such as the eagles of the army, the so-called sacred vessels of the temples, and the Cybele meteorite, brought to Rome in 204 B.C.

Before we adopt an attitude of supercilious contempt of fetich worshipers, let us be very certain that we ourselves are carrying no lucky pennies, esteeming no day above another, playing no favorite numbers, hiding in our pockets no "lef' hin' foot of a grave-yard rabbit," wearing no swastikas, and following no "hunches."

The theory and practice of the *Tabu*, the opposite of fetichism, are most interesting, but time presses and I proceed to the next manifestation of the religious impulse, *Animism*, the worship of ghosts, demons, and spirits. This is invariably a religion of fear, of endless propitiation and bargaining, of exact and meticulous ritual; and I read with a gasp of astonishment the statement made recently by an authority that there are now on this little planet 136,325,000 animists. I mention two of the most common types of animism. First, the religion of most savage tribes, with the inevitable medicine man. The chief function of this rather horrible personage is to ward off, by certain abstruse incantations,

the onset of hostile goblins which, unless constantly and handsomely pacified, would cause pestilence, famine, marital infidelity, barrenness, and a thousand other calamities, and then gibber in fiendish glee over the wreckage. It will be observed that fetichism plays an important part in animistic systems.

Second, ancestor worship. Among the Romans, wax masks (*imagines*) of distinguished forbears were carefully kept in the *alae*, and at funerals were donned by mummers and worn in the procession. We learn from Servius that, at the obsequies of Marcellus, nephew of Augustus, 600 *imagines* were thus displayed. In modern China and Japan, as everyone knows, ancestors must be propitiated in various ways, must on no account be neglected or forgotten, and must be consulted on all matters of importance. Lack of time prevents the citation of further examples.

Pantheism next claims our attention. There have been, of course, many definitions of the term and numerous and more or less widely differing theories about the doctrine. I am not here concerned, for instance, with Spinoza's theistic pantheism (faith in God as an infinite and eternal reality, in whose infinity the temporal, finite world is swallowed up — acosmism), nor with Haeckel's atheistic pantheism (the conception of the universe as a vast unity in which deity is lost — pancosmism), but with the more popular doctrine so widely held in ancient times (and, in a considerably smaller degree, today), namely, that God is all; that God and nature are inseparable and identical; that God is not transcendent but immanent; that everything partakes of the nature of God. Among the discoveries at Oxyrynchus was part of a lost "gospel," containing this sentence: "Jesus saith: Where-soever they may be, they are not without God; and where there is one alone, even thus am I with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and I am there."

Pantheism in its simplest form is nothing more nor less than nature worship, and as such it is found among all savage and many civilized peoples. Various potencies and forces of nature have been worshiped by men, but I suppose there is no doubt that of all the objects, animate and inanimate, before which human

souls have bowed in veneration, the sun has had far and away the largest number of votaries. Among more backward and primitive races he was (and is) adored as a god; among more highly civilized nations, he was revered as a type or symbol of divinity; among others still, he was personified and called Mithra, Helios, Ra, etc.

On December 30, 1926, the newspapers carried an account of a rather startling essay presented the day before to one of the sections of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The author was a distinguished Russian archaeologist, and his subject was "Historiometry." Briefly, he advanced the theory that world history is guided neither by Providence nor by the will of man, but that all human beings are slaves of the sun and its vast electrical power. His researches into sunspot records, extended through Chinese, Arabian, Armenian, and other ancient annals, led him to the opinion that there is a close and vital connection between the gigantic disturbances on the sun and the great upheavals of earth history. He reports finding the eleven-year cycles divided as follows in their effect on human life: Three years of minimum excitability among mankind, two years of growing excitability, three years of maximum excitability (through which — Heaven help us! — we are now passing), and finally three years of decline to the minimum which closes the cycle. He concludes: "The existence of a dependence of the behavior of humanity upon sunspot activity should be considered and established."

We learn from the Bible that in his old age Solomon turned to certain false gods, including Milcom and Ashtoreth. Now Milcom was an Ammonite sun god, and Astoreth a moon goddess worshiped by the Phoenicians. It is at least possible that the two great brazen pillars, Jachin and Boaz, which stood, we are told, in the "porch" of the Temple, were imitations of similar adornments of the temple of Venus at Paphos on the island of Cyprus, built about a hundred years before the marvelous sacred edifice on Mount Moriah. Tyrian workmen erected both buildings, and the two pillars at the entrance of the Cyprian structure are said to

have been decorated with representations of the sun and moon. The fact that Solomon's apostasy occurred many years after the completion of the Temple does not, it seems to me, affect the probability of the parallelism.

It would be interesting to enter here into certain other details, but considerations of space make it necessary to proceed to the next manifestation of the religious impulse, *Polytheism*.

There is no question in my own mind, though the matter has been warmly debated, that polytheism was the logical result of pantheism — that the worship of a heterogeneous congeries of gods and goddesses grew directly out of nature worship, through the simple and beautiful ministry of personification. In other words, all the forces, potencies, aspects, phases of nature were worshiped, among practically all ancient nations (and are still worshiped among many modern tribes low in the scale of civilization), under the name of a god or a goddess who presided over this force or that, this aspect or that, and who, in his or her attributes, was a faithful portrait of the force or aspect. For example, it is possible, as has already been pointed out, to find a sun god almost anywhere one searches for him. Likewise, wisdom, beauty, fruitfulness, moisture, violence, thunder, mildew, and a hundred others, were personified and worshiped and feared and propitiated.

Propitiation, indeed, is the most important religious exercise in polytheistic systems; for, with so large a number of divinities, many will inevitably represent hostile potencies. These, then, must ever and anon be appeased by the strict observance of an elaborate ritual, together with divers sacrifices — offered with a frightfulness which increases with the decrease of culture and enlightenment.

The idea that deity and nature are inseparable is, obviously, responsible for the presence in many religions of water nymphs, mountain sprites, tree spirits; a whole host of kindly protectors of the farmer and his flocks and crops, the householder and his pantry and hearth, the sailor, the merchant, the soldier, the hunter.

Even the ancient Hebrews seem to have come to believe in one God at a rather late period in their history. They were frequently wavering and irresolute in their allegiance to him, and sometimes they forgot him entirely, and went after the false gods of various neighboring peoples. Moreover, when they had been scourged back to the true path by their prophets and priests, they still believed in the existence of other gods than their own. We read with astonishment in the Eighty-Sixth Psalm: "Among the gods there is none like unto thee, O Lord; neither are there any works like unto thy works."

Jonah, ordered by Jehovah to go to Nineveh and preach, "rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord." In other words, Jonah labored under the popular delusion that Jehovah was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their descendants, and had no jurisdiction outside his own borders — foreign countries being presided over by their own deities, who resembled Jehovah, but were inferior to him in power.

We come now to *Phallism*, the worship of the principle of generation and fertility. It is not in the least strange that primitive, unphilosophic men elevated this principle into the dignity of godhead. They looked about them and saw, first of all, birth and growth and development — in nature, among animals, within their own stockades and dwellings. There must be, they said, some mighty and mysterious power which causes this universal fruitfulness. In time they began to worship that power, by means of a symbolism which to us appears almost inexplicable. But relics of this curious symbolism have been found in such profusion all over the ancient world that we can entertain no doubt of the very wide extent and influence of phallic systems.

Without entering into further particulars, let us note now that phallism was an attribute worship; that is to say, deity was worshiped by phallists through what they regarded as the chief of the divine potencies. I have suggested above that polytheistic theogonies very likely grew out of the personification of the forces of nature. It is at least possible, however, that, in the minds of many worshippers, particularly the more enlightened, Jupiter, Astarte,

Thor, Osiris, Dionysus, were personifications, not of natural forces, but of attributes of the true God — dimly apprehended. Initiates of the Mysteries (to be discussed later) were probably taught some sort of monotheistic doctrine, and many crumbs must have fallen from their laden table.

The Hebrews had many different names for Jehovah, each referring to some attribute. For example, Elohim signifies the aggregate of the mighty forces in nature. Adonai is rendered "Lord" in our Bible. The name IHVH, a summary of all the divine powers, was held to be sacred and unpronounceable. In our version of it, Jehovah, the vowels are borrowed from Adonai, and its correct pronunciation will, in all probability, never be ascertained. Another striking example of attribute names of deity will be cited in connection with the next point.

The Bible presents many instances of emphasis on attributes. This, like the occurrence of bits of anthropomorphism, is undoubtedly due to the efforts of the Biblical writers to bring Infinity down to the reach of finite minds. All through the book there are pictures of Deity which mortals can see and comprehend: "The Lord is my shepherd," "The shadow of a great rock in a weary land," "I am the vine, ye are the branches," "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him."

To me the *Mysteries* are far and away the most interesting form of ancient religious observance. Our information about them is scanty, for the vows of secrecy were well kept. But it is fairly certain, as suggested above, that in some of them the doctrine of a great, supreme Being, above all gods, was inculcated by means of symbols and allegories and dramas, and that in all of them a life beyond the grave was promised to the initiates. Immortality was presented pictorially, as a rule through the yearly death and resurrection of nature or the daily setting and rising of the sun. The Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis appears here and there, as well as progressive reincarnation; but, upon the whole, the teachings of the Mysteries, so far as they can be ascertained today, both concerning the nature of God and the eternal life of the soul, were impressive and beautiful.

We know more about the Mysteries of Eleusis than we do of any other similar initiation, but there was hardly a civilized nation of antiquity which did not have its secret rites. For instance, in Persia we find the Mysteries of Mithra — embellished with the wisdom of Zoroaster; in Gaul, the Druids, as Caesar tells us, computed the size of the universe and taught their neophytes that the soul did not perish, but passed from one body into another; in Egypt, Osiris and Isis furnished the dramatic material for the instruction of seekers after truth. We note also, at various points in the ancient world, Mysteries of Adonis, of Dionysus, of the Cabiri, of Attis and Cybele, Orphic Mysteries, and others less important. In concluding this section, I may say that it is my firm belief that the influence of these sacred dramas upon the life and thought of their time has been vastly underestimated by students of the history of religion.

Finally, *Trinitarianism*. The doctrine of the Trinity, or of a trinity, is to be found in practically every religious system, ancient and modern. Among the Druids, the trinity was composed of Hesuls, Belenus, and Tharamis; the Hindus worshiped their great god (whose true name, like that of the God of the Hebrews, could not lawfully be pronounced) under the three attribute names of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva; the trinity of the Ethiopians consisted of Neph-Amon (the creator), Phtha (matter), Neith (thought). Upon the southern spur of the Capitoline Hill, in ancient Rome, there stood the great Capitolium, a triple temple of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. Innumerable other instances might be cited.

The essential feature in trinitarianism is mediation. The learned Hebrew teachers, who, during the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, evolved and developed that curious and fascinating theosophy known as the Kabbalah, insisted that the Great Unknowable One, being himself Infinity, could not stoop to the creation of the finite; and so he sent out from the infinite light in which he dwelt and which he was, a series of emanations (*Sephiroth*), which performed the actual work of making matter and the world, led and inspired by "the creative energy pro-

ceeding from the Father"—a designation the rabbis applied to the letter Yod, the first letter of the Great Name, IHVH.

The Gnostics, whom St. Paul combats so vigorously in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, held views regarding intermediary potencies quite like those of the Kabbalists. Between God and his creation there intervened Thrones, Angelic Lords, Celestial Powers, Rulers, Elemental Spirits, and the Demiurge (the actual creator). Incidentally, the Hebrew word, Elohim, referred to above, has a very similar connotation. This impressive array of potencies the Gnostics called τὸ πλήρωμα. St. Paul's reply was: "For in him [Christ] dwelleth all the fulness [τὸ πλήρωμα] of the Godhead bodily."

In the Greek and Roman popular religions, although there was no such definite conception of a trinity as is found in most other ancient systems, there was a mediator. The Greeks called him Hermes, the Romans, Mercurius; and he was equipped with winged sandals, that he might the more easily fly to and fro between heaven and earth. In Egypt, Horus (etymologically, possibly the same name as Hermes) performed a similar function. The doctrine of the Trinity held by modern Christians is, in its essentials, entirely different from all other trinitarian conceptions.

Four concluding remarks, by way of summary, and without discussion. First: Sages in all periods of history have presented deity in symbols, allegories, and pictures, that the finite might be enabled to apprehend a bit more clearly the infinite. And the conception of deity, arrived at independently by these earnest seekers after divine light was in all important respects the same.

Second: There have always been, and are now, religious beliefs held by the wise and enlightened which differ widely from those of the unthinking masses.

Third: Divine revelation has ever been, is now, and will ever be, progressive, and adapted to the individual capacity to receive.

Fourth: In these days of religious bigotry and intolerance, there is, I think, a genuine obligation resting upon you and me to be patient, open-minded, and charitable; and to remember that wisdom was not born with us and will very likely be here when we have passed on.

DE LOQUELA DIGITORUM

By EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD
The College for Women, Western Reserve University

The *Disputatio regalis et nobilissimi iuvenis Pippini cum Albino scholastico*, with the wide variety of material included in its brief questions and answers, contains almost endless suggestions for investigation and comment on the workings of the Carolingian mind at school. Since its inclusion by Professor Beeson in his *Primer of Medieval Latin* (pages 169-73) has made it accessible to an increasing number of readers, it seems pertinent here to comment on one at least of the many matters it involves. The topic of finger notation has been more thoroughly discussed elsewhere,¹ but not, I think, in a classical periodical, and not with emphasis on the later Latin materials.

Albinus puts the question, "I saw a man holding eight in his hand, and from the eight he took seven, and six remained."² It is apparently so easy a question that Pippin scorns to give a direct answer, in words at least, and merely remarks, "The boys in school know that." I say "in words" because it is very likely that a rapid bit of finger movement accompanied his answer. The ancient Romans were doubtless the more proficient in finger reckoning because of their fondness for the game of morra. One recalls, too, Quintilian's strictures on the orator who shows his lack of education, not by hesitating over the sum, but by an ignorant awkwardness in the motion of his fingers dur-

¹ Cf. Smith, D. E., *History of Mathematics*, II, 196-202; Richardson, L. J., "Digital Reckoning among the Ancients," *American Mathematical Monthly*, XXIII (1916), 7-13. Further bibliography will be found in each of these. The article *digitus* (c), in *computatione*, in the *Thesaurus*, is particularly rich in suggestions to the classical student.

² Beeson p. 172, line 30: *Vidi hominem octo in manu tenentem et de octonis rapuit septem, et remanserunt sex.*

ing the reckoning.³ Martianus Capella's description of *Arithmetica* paying Jove a pretty compliment by spelling out his name on her fingers would lose too much of its picturesque rhetoric in the translation — *digiti vero virginis recursantes et quodam incomprehensae mobilitatis scaturrigine vermiculati.*"⁴ In passing, it is noteworthy that *Philosophia* fails to understand the action, and *Pallas*, who apparently had a better education or more native intelligence, had to explain it to her.

Since Albinus' riddle is not explained in the *Primer* it might be well to go into some detail here, basing my suggestion on an authority whom Albinus would gladly have recognized, the Venerable Bede. He began his work *De Temporum Ratione* by pointing out the value of a thorough knowledge of finger notation for all who intended to read his account, that they might the better keep account of the chronology.⁵ He then gives careful instructions for counting on the fingers, instructions which correspond to the scattered information we have about the Greek and Roman methods, to the complete method as described by Nicolaus Rhabda of Smyrna in the same century, and to those of the diagrams in the mathematical works of the Renaissance.⁶ Truly a worthy *industria*, which had proved itself in so many centuries and over so wide a territory as this.

For the numbers from one to ten his instructions may be briefly stated as follows: for *one*, using the left hand, as for all numbers under a hundred, bend the little finger at the middle joint with

³ Quintilian *Inst. Or.* i. 10. 35: *In causis vero frequentissime versari solet; in quibus actor, non dico, si circa summas trepidat sed si incerto aut indecoro gestu a computatione dissentit, iudicatur indoctus.*

⁴ Martianus Capella *De Nuptiis* vii. 729.

⁵ Giles, J. A., *Ven. Bedae Opera quae supersunt omnia*, VI, 141. *De Temporum Ratione*, Cap. i. *De computo vel loquela digitorum.* *De Temporum ratione* (Domino iuvante) dicturi necessarium duximus, utilissimam primo, promptissimamque flexus digitorum, paucis praemonstrare solertiam, ut cum maximam computandi facilitatem dederimus, tum paratiore legentium ingenio ad investigandam dilucidandamque computando seriem temporum veniamus. Neque enim contemnenda, parvive pendenda est regula, cujus omnes pene sacrae expositores Scripturae, non minus quam literarum figuras monstrantur amplecti.

⁶ Cf. Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

the tip of the finger touching the palm; for *two* bend the fourth finger also; for *three* add the middle finger; for *four* raise the little finger, keeping the other two bent; for *five* raise the fourth finger, leaving the middle finger bent. This brings us to the point of Albinus' riddle. For *six* the fourth finger alone is pressed against the middle of the palm, for *seven* the little finger is bent well down over the palm, with the others extended; and for *eight* the fourth finger is also closed on the palm. So quite literally one may take seven from eight and have six left. For the sake of round numbers, bend the third finger also against the palm for nine and press the nail of the index finger against the middle joint of the thumb for *ten*.⁷ For higher reckoning I refer you to the Venerable Bede or to his modern debtors.

Since I am being rather discursive than systematic I cannot resist a digression for the sake of Bede's quotation from Jerome on the number *thirty*. In his account of the numerals he instructs us, "When you say thirty, join the nails of the index finger and thumb in a gentle embrace." On the significance of this number he has already quoted Jerome's statement, made most inconsistently in his famous diatribe against matrimony, that the number thirty is connected with marriage, "for the very joining of the fingers, as if embracing and allying each other with a tender kiss, depicts the husband and wife."⁸ What a delightful contrast this is to other parts of the same book "agayn Jovinian" and to the

⁷ Giles, VI, 142: *Primo fit indigitatio in laeva manu, tali modo. Quum ergo dicis Unum, minimum in laeva digitum inflectens, in medium palmae artum infiges. Quum dicis Duo, secundum a minimo flexum, ibidem impones. Quum dicis Tria, tertium similiter afflectes. Quum dicis Quatuor, itidem minimum levabis. Quum dicis Quinque, secundum a minimo similiter eriges. Quum dicis Sex, tertium nihilominus elevabis, medio dumtaxat solo, qui Medicus appellatur, in medium palmae fixo.*

Quum dicis Septem, minimum solum, caeteris interim levatis, super palmae radicem pones. Juxta quam quum dicis Octo, medium, quum dicis Novem impudicum e regione compones. Quum dicis Decem, unguem indicis in medio figes artu pollicis. Cf. the diagrams in Smith, II, 198.

⁸ Giles, VI, 142: *Quum dicis Triginta, ungues indicis et pollicis blando conjunges amplexu.* Jerome, *adv. Jovinianum* i. 3, ap. Bede, Giles, VI, 141: *Triginta referuntur ad nuptias; nam et ipsa digitorum conjunctio, quasi molli osculo se complectens et foederans, maritum pingit et conjugem.*

many books of "wikked wyves" descended from it to vex the Wife of Bath and others perhaps less able to defend themselves. Surely the authors of such books must have suffered some compunctions when their pages numbered the conjugal thirty.

It is a pity that the introduction of the less cumbersome Arabic numerals and the ever useful zero have caused the art of finger computation to be reduced to its lowest terms. Dr. Smith lists among its purposes the aid it gave in bargaining, especially when the buyer and seller spoke different languages. In this connection the Greek and Italian vase-paintings showing the merchant and customer bargaining for oil, wine, or other goods, and indicating the prices on their fingers, are of interest.⁹

For the phrasing of Albinus' question we may refer to Bede's discussion of the use of finger notation for secret conversation. He reminds us that this computation may be used also as a sort of "manual speech," as much for the sake of practice as for amusement, by substituting the numerals in turn for the letters of the alphabet and so being able to carry on a conversation even at a distance with any who know the art, meanwhile mystifying those ignorant of it. "When you wish to indicate the first letter of the alphabet," he says, "hold one in your hand," a phrase corresponding closely with Albinus' *octo in manu tenentem*. But how much of human interest there is in the rest of the passage quoted.¹⁰ Should we need any more to remind us how well Bede understood his younger pupils and what pleasure could be added to arithmetic by the chance to show off one's cleverness and mystify the unskilled in collaboration with anyone else who knew *hanc indus-*

⁹ Cf. de Walle, F. J. M., "La Représentation de la Vente de l'Huile à Athènes," *Révue Archæologique*, Vme Serie, XXIII (1926), 282-295, esp. figures 3 and 6.

¹⁰ Giles, VI, 143: *Potest autem et de ipso quem prænотavi computo quaedam manualis loquela, tam ingenii exercendi quam ludi agendi gratia figurari; qua literis quis singillatim expressa verba, quæ isdem literis contineantur, alteri qui hanc noverit industriam, tametsi procul posito, loquenda atque intelligenda contradat, vel necessaria quæque per hæc occultius innuendo significans, vel imperitos quosque divinando deludens. Cujus ordo ludi vel loquelæ talis est: Quum primam alphabeti literam intimare cupis, unum in manu teneto; Quum secundum duo; Quum tertium, tria; Et sic ex ordine cæteras.*

triam? Bede's example for this *industria* is suggestive also of its more serious uses, for he shows how to express the words *Caute age* on the fingers.

Indeed, another passage may be found in the *Primer* to illustrate the use of finger language in a serious crisis. In the extract given from Ermoldus Nigellus, *De rebus gestis Ludovici Pii*,¹¹ Zadun the Moor has been captured by the Franks and forced to bid his men surrender to them. He obediently shouts to them to open the long-closed gates, meanwhile, though pretending it an empty gesture, signalling to them on his fingers to continue their resistance. Unfortunately one of the Franks recognized the ruse and struck him, "admiring the Moor, but even more his cleverness."

Isidore of Seville shows that the military use of finger speech was known in his day, and characteristically quotes several lines of description of a most modern young person to illustrate one of its other uses; for the last of the admirers by whom the "Girl from Tarentum" is surrounded have to content themselves with the words, kind ones we hope, that she forms for them with her fingers. Perhaps her other lovers had never learned to talk in this fashion.¹² Isidore shows somewhat more fairness to the

¹¹ Beeson, p. 330, lines 177-82, quoted from Dümmler, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, II, "De rebus gestis Ludovici Pii," lines 483-92.

Tum manus ad muros tendens vocitabat amicos:

"Pandite iam, socii, claustra vetata diu."

Ingeniosus item digitos curvabat, et ungues

Figebat palmis, haec simulanter agens,

Hoc autem indicio signabat castra tenenda.

Sed tamen invitus, "Pandite" voce vocat.

¹² Isidore *Etymologiae* i. 26: *Sunt quaedam et digitorum notae, sunt et oculorum, quibus secum taciti proculque distantes loquuntur. Sicut mos est militaris, ut quotiens consentit exercitus, quia voce non potest, manu promittat. Alii, quia voce non possunt, gladiatorum motu salutant. Ennius de quadam impudica (Naev. Com. 75).*

Quasi in choro pila

ludens da[ta]tim dat sese et communem facit.

Alium tenet, alii adnecat, alibi manus

est occupata, alii percellit pedem,

alii dat anulum [ex]spectandum, a labris

alium invocat, cum alio cantat; adtamen

aliis dat digito litteras.

ladies than some of his successors, for he caps the example of the Tarentine girl, who, however ancient the Punic Wars may seem to our modern maidens, might have given them points on how to handle several men at a time, by a quotation from Solomon about the wicked man who "walketh with a froward mouth" — *Annu it oculo, terit pede, digito loquitur* (Proverbs 6:13).

One of the most potent reasons for the importance of finger speech in the middle ages was, of course, the monastic rule of silence, especially at meals, where some means of communication might seem essential to a hungry monk. The extremes to which this might go are lamented by Giraldus Cambrensis, who cites conditions at Canterbury in 1177.¹³ The prior had so many gestures to make to the monks who served him, and the serves and monks at the lower tables found frequent communication so necessary that Giraldus thought their gestures of fingers and hands and even arms, and their whispering, far more frivolous and licentious than was becoming to their order. Indeed, he fancied himself among actors and jesters rather than cloistered monks. It is no wonder that he thought to speak "human words" with due modesty would be more consonant with their position and respect than to use signs and whispers so merrily in "mute garrulity." In the *insula domus Ailbei*, on the other hand, where the monks suffered none of the infirmities of flesh and spirit that hover about the human race, they talked only by signs made with eyes or fingers.¹⁴

¹³ Giraldus Cambrensis *De rebus a se gestis* ii. 5, ed. Brewer, Rolls Series, I, 51: *Tot etenim prior ad monachos servientes, et illi e contra ad mensas inferiores exenia ferendo, et hi quibus ferebantur gratias referendo, digitorum et manuum ac brachiorum gesticulationibus et sibilis ore pro sermonibus longe levius atque licentius quam deceret effluebant; ut quasi ad ludos scenicos aut inter histriones et joculariores sibi viderentur constitutus. Esset itaque magis ordini consonum et honestati verbis humanis cum modestia loqui, quam muta in hunc modum garrulitate signis et sibilis tam joculariter uti.*

¹⁴ *Peregrinatio S. Brandani*, ed. C. Schroder, *Sancti Brandani*, p. 17.

A JOURNEY THROUGH THE ROMAN EMPIRE

By ADELINE BELLE HAWES
Rome

*Fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam:
Urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat.*

Not exactly a fireside journey this, but one which can be taken without leaving Rome by means of the new Museum of the Roman Empire, which was opened in the spring of 1927.¹ For the study of Roman life and Roman remains in any one province, some knowledge of the Empire in general is essential, and a visit to this museum will serve both to illustrate and to inspire such study. The collection has brought together, by means of casts, models, reproductions, photographs, and plans, examples of Roman remains in all parts of the world which were once parts of the Roman Empire; and the visitor will be constantly reminded that not only did all roads lead to Rome, but that the Roman roads led Rome all over the Empire. When Juvenal was lamenting the cosmopolitan tendency in Rome, he lacked the vision to perceive that when the City became less Roman, the world was becoming more Roman.

The rooms in the museum are all so clearly indicated that the visitor can take his own choice as to which part of the Empire he will make the beginning of his journey. In the Atrium through which we enter there are a few objects suggestive of the Empire, and one is a cast of that majestic Roman eagle from the Forum of Trajan which is now in the vestibule of the Church of the SS. Apostoli. There is something peculiarly appropriate in seeing it here, for in looking at that eagle it seems as if he might have been flying all over the Empire before coming to rest in the wreath into which he is just flying now. Before going to any one province

¹ For a brief account of this museum see *CLASSICAL JOURNAL*, XXIII, 56.

it will be of interest to look also at the series of large photographs of the oldest map of the world, the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, a work of the late Empire, which is now in Vienna.

In the room devoted to Italian regions a little idea is given of Roman remains in Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, and also in the northern parts of Italy, but the Roman buildings not in Italy will attract more attention.

Spain is one of the most interesting parts of the Empire, that province which gave to the Roman world two of its greatest rulers, as well as so many authors whose names became famous in the literature of Rome. It has been said of Spain that she was more Roman than the Romans, and that province gained a high degree of civilization and culture very early in the Roman period. In this room we find photographs of some of the most imposing remains, including the great aqueduct near Tarragona, the marvelous Alcantara bridge, the well-preserved theater at Merida, and various others. Some of the small stele are to be noticed because they furnish examples of provincial art in Spain. Among the most interesting objects in the room are casts of several bronze tablets which contain some of the municipal laws which were in force in Spanish cities and thus give important data in regard to municipal life. We may see here the famous laws of Salpensa and Malaga of the time of Domitian which give regulations in regard to elections, acquisition of citizenship, and various matters. These inscriptions may indeed be read much more easily in the *Corpus*, but the reproductions, even though we give little time to the words, enable us to see the inscription as a whole as the people of the Roman Empire saw it.² In this room one is inclined to stop and dream of what may be learned in the future, for scientific excavation in Spain is comparatively recent, although enough has been done to show that there is probably archaeological wealth in that country which has hardly been guessed at as yet.

The examples from Britain are very scanty. This is regrettable, for it is now known that Britain attained a higher degree of civil-

² C. I. L., 5439, 6278, 1963-1964.

ization and prosperity under the Roman Empire than was formerly supposed, and scholars are more and more waking up to the importance of Britain as a field for archaeological research. One thing that will attract attention in this room is a plan of Roman London, showing what part of the present city was occupied by Londinium. We should notice also a cast of the stele of a Roman centurion of the last part of the first century A.D. This was found at Colchester and is of interest for the complete uniform, which is represented in all its details. There is also the stele of another Roman soldier, who was killed in the Dacian war. The plan of a Roman house in Silchester and of the Roman baths in Bath will also be noticed.

From Germany there is nothing more interesting than two reliefs from the famous Igel Monument, and the visitor will regret that there are only two. One of these represents a *cena familiaris*, and the other a typical scene of industrial activity, such as are to be seen on many a tombstone. A large photograph shows this monument as a whole, but a model is greatly to be desired. It is one of the most impressive remains in Roman Germany and useful for the study of Roman art in the western provinces.

Those who are familiar with the Roman buildings of southern France will be impressed with what is *not* seen in the room devoted to the Galliae, but it is to be remembered, of this room as of the entire museum, that the collection is not a thing complete but only a beginning to which more and more will be added as time goes on. France is so rich in remains of the Roman period that it is especially gratifying to know that the directors of the museum are now giving attention to enlarging and enriching this part of the collection. Among the many reproductions in this room one that ought to be mentioned is a cast of the great bronze tablet now in Lyons which contains a part of the speech of Claudius in which he gave his approval to the request of the Gauls to send members to the Roman Senate. It will be remembered that the substance of this speech is given by Tacitus, and this table is of special interest as showing that historian's method in the use of original documents. It would be of still more value

if it could have been preserved entire, so that we might have compared the version of Tacitus with the original as a whole. Other objects which no one could fail to notice are casts of that well-known and delightful relief of a school scene, and the one of a wine-boat on the Moselle. These are in the Museum of Trèves, which is especially rich in objects illustrative of Roman life. A Christian sarcophagus will attract attention with its amusing relief of Noah's Ark.

Of all the Roman buildings which are still standing there are none more remarkable than those on the eastern side of the Adriatic, and the model of the Palace of Diocletian at Spalato would be worth going far to see. When we read in books that a mediaeval city of nearly twenty thousand people stood within the walls of this palace, it is a strain on the imagination to try to visualize it. But with this model, which measures about eight feet each way, before us, we can begin to understand. The mausoleum is not only "the gem of the palace," but it is one of the best preserved of ancient monuments, and the visitor will be glad to find at the end of the corridor near by a large model of the mausoleum by itself. In this room, as in many others, what is seen recalls much that is invisible, and one thinks of the whole reign of Diocletian, all that it was and tried to be. We may not perhaps go quite as far as Mommsen, of whom the story is told that in his old age he declared that if he could live his life over again he would begin his study of Roman history with Diocletian. But anyone who begins the study of this period will want to learn more and more of it.

In the room devoted to the Moesia, which included a large part of Serbia, Bulgaria, and Roumania, we may see the façade of the great monument at Adamclisi in memory of the soldiers who fell in the Dacian war. The inscription states that the Emperor Trajan erected this *in honorem et memoriam fortissimorum virorum qui . . . pro republica occubuerant*. In reading these words one could hardly fail to think of the great number of monuments with similar inscriptions which have been erected in Europe since

1918. A series of sculptures from the monument at Adamelisi may be seen on the stairway.

The room where Roman remains from Achaia-Macedonia are shown has its interest, for the Roman influence in Greece in the time of the Empire and the condition of Greece in that period are subjects to which more attention will be given in the future than has been given in the past. In this room we may read the inscription which commemorates the victory of the Romans over King Perseus at Pydna in 168 B.C., an event to be remembered, as it was the first of Roman conquests outside Italy and was, as the Greek historian Polybius says, "the beginning of the universal empire of Rome."

In the next room to this are Crete and Cyrenaica. These two are in the same room because they formed a single province in the time of the Empire. We may see here fine models of the Odeon at Crete and the *Thermae* of Cyrene.

The civilizing influence of the Romans is nowhere more clearly to be seen than in North Africa, and the abundance of Roman buildings still standing there is so well known that it will cause no surprise to find that the rooms devoted to that region are especially rich in models. There is one of the Arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli, erected in 163 A.D. When the Italians took Tripoli in the year 1911-1912, the lower half of this monument had become buried in the earth, and the interior was used for a cinema. Other impressive models are of the *Thermae* at Leptis Magna, which was the birthplace of the Emperor Septimius Severus, of the Amphitheater at Sabrata, the Capitol and part of the Forum at Thugga. There are several models also of buildings at Timgad, which has been called the African Pompeii. We may see the Capitol, the Arch of Trajan, one of the markets, which, as we learn from inscriptions on the building, was given to the city by a certain Sertius and his wife Cornelia Valentina Tucciana, and the Library. In looking at the inscription which tells us that this building was a library and the gift of a public-spirited citizen, it is interesting to recall its history, for it was found in three pieces, in three different places, and in three different years. The third

piece, not found until two years after the second, had been built into the wall of a hut, together with other rubble.

There are some interesting photographs of mosaics in these rooms, one of which represents a Roman country villa. And of special interest is a reproduction of the mosaic, now in the Bardo Museum in Tunis, which represents Vergil composing the *Aeneid*, with Clio and Melpomene standing on either hand. The peasant-like face which is given to the poet makes one wonder if that was really the artist's conception of Vergil, or if it was simply what he was able to achieve. Since Africa is notably rich in mosaics, it is to be hoped that many reproductions may be secured for this room, enough to give the visitor some conception of the abundance as well as the value of Roman mosaics in Africa. Going on from these rooms to Egypt we shall see fine reproductions of some of the famous portraits of the Greco-Roman period, so vivid that you feel that they may be about to speak. The papyri of the same period, which, though unimportant in one way, are of unfailing interest, are illustrated by a photograph of one. This contains the petition of a widow who was applying to the government for a pension, and looking at that poor old torn document we may hope that her request was granted. But more impressive perhaps than anything else in this room is the trilingual inscription found at Philae which records the Ethiopian expedition of Cornelius Gallus.³ This will at once recall the tragic story of that ill-starred soldier-poet. He was a friend of Vergil, whose admiration for him was as great as his affection, and yet Vergil was constrained to withdraw from the fourth *Georgic* the tribute paid to Gallus in the first edition and substitute a story as irrelevant as it is beautiful. He was famous for centuries not only as a great poet, but as the founder of a great department of Latin poetry, and yet of his poems not a line remains. And he was a successful and distinguished general who, whether justly or not, was driven into exile and ended his life by suicide. The whole story comes back very vividly when we stand before this abiding record from far away Philae, and some people

³ C. I. L., III, 141475.

who read it today may echo Ovid's wish and hope that the charge of disloyalty was false, and that

If anything remains from us beyond mere name and shade,
In the Elysian Valley Gallus too abides.

The recent excavations in Syria have given renewed interest to that province, and in this room there are magnificent photographs for the visitor to enjoy. The sight of such buildings must make anyone want to know more of the history of Syria in the Roman period.

From Galatia we find a model of the temple at Ancyra, one of the most interesting of ancient monuments because of its famous inscription recording the *Res Gestae* of Augustus. A complete reproduction of this inscription is now being made, and there will be a certain thrill in reading it in exact facsimile.

From Aspendus there is a fine photograph of a great Roman aqueduct, but none as yet of that marvelous Roman theater which, standing all alone in the desert now, is one of the most majestic and impressive remains of antiquity anywhere to be found.

Even a slight knowledge of the eastern provinces of the Empire as they were then and as they are now will be enough to make anyone agree with Henderson when he says, "The twentieth century may well bow its head in confusion and shame before the second when the history of Asia Minor lies open for the reading."⁴

Professor Showerman has well said that Rome is "the one place in all the world where the student may be stimulated to pass in review the whole course of western history,"⁵ and stimulating illustrations for such a review have been brought together in this museum. The more we study the Roman Empire the more must we realize what a field there is in that period for continued investigation and new discoveries. The more we learn of the Roman Empire the more shall we be inclined to make our own the words of that "last poet of classical Rome," and say,

Huius pacificis debemus moribus omnes
Quod cuncti gens una sumus.

⁴ *Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian*, 87.

⁵ *Eternal Rome*, II, 584.

THE TRIAL OF SOCRATES ¹

By J. O. LOFBERG
Oberlin College

"To recall Socrates," said Phaedo, "whether I speak myself or hear another speak of him, is my greatest pleasure." So spoke Phaedo, and so must many philologists have felt.² Nothing else can explain the perennial interest in the *Defense of Socrates*. A recent, if not the most recent,³ manifestation of this interest is found in the English *Annual of the Rationalistic Press Association* (1926) in an article by J. B. Bury on the "Trial of Socrates." Any article from the pen of Professor Bury merits attention, and this one is no exception. The ostensible reason for discussion of this subject in such a periodical is obviously to prove something about the Athenian attitude toward rationalism, and early in the essay the author reaches the conclusion (p. 19) "that notwithstanding the prevalence of orthodox views and prejudices at

¹ Read before the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, at the University of Michigan, April 15, 1927.

² This interest is not limited to philologists nor displayed merely in papers before learned societies or in classical periodicals. Two weeks before this paper was read at Ann Arbor newspapers were carrying Associated Press dispatches about a revival of interest in the case of Socrates in Athens. M. Paradopoulos was urging a reconsideration of the death verdict by the supreme court, because the "honor of Greece requires a reversion of the judgment and a judicial declaration of Socrates' innocence." To the student of Athenian law and oratory one of the most interesting points in this attempt to open a case that was presumably closed 2326 years ago is the reason offered by M. Paradopoulos for bringing the matter up again. "The death verdict was passed," said he, "by the judges of the Athenian democracy 'against their better judgment'." Just so in the days of Socrates miscarriage of justice was explained as due to the cleverness of orators who "deceived the jurors."

³ The most recent is, I believe, a paper by Professor Shero on Plato's *Apology* and Xenophon's *Apology* (*Classical Weekly*, Jan. 31, 1927). Professor Shero devotes his attention almost entirely to "the most striking discrepancies between the two *Apologies*."

Athens, there is no clear evidence of a policy of pure and simple persecution of free thought as such. When for some other reason it was desired to suppress somebody, a charge of unorthodoxy was a facile means to excite the prejudices of the average citizens who served in the jury courts." With this point of view the present writer has now no disposition to quarrel, even though he finds less comfort therein than does Professor Bury. About all that the latter's conclusion means is that the inconspicuous ἀπράγμων might think and talk as he pleased, and that the "one who was a little different from others in some particulars" might think as he pleased, provided he kept it to himself. The bearing of this theory on the case of Socrates is easily seen. Socrates was ✓an inveterate critic of democracy. He was also notorious for ✓religious heresies. The leading democrats of the early fourth century dared not risk the possible effects that his political criticisms might have on the recently restored δῆμος and accordingly decided to suppress him. The only weapon available, and the easiest for them to use against him, was the "prejudices against his religious heresies." This suggestion is by no means new. It has been offered by editors of Plato's *Apology* (Riddell, p. xii; Dyer, p. 24) and doubtless by many others. It has, however, the merit of answering anew the question that never seems satisfactorily answered: Why did the charge against Socrates come when it did?

Professor Bury cannot resist the temptation to touch on the favorite topic of all who discuss the trial, the relation of the Platonic *Apology* to the actual speech of Socrates. Some of his conclusions are in large part responsible for the present paper, and I shall summarize them briefly: Plato's *Apology* does not supply a complete account of the trial, because: 1) Socrates makes no categorical denial of the charge of unorthodoxy, as he does in the Xenophontic *Apology*; 2) it treats inconclusively of the καὶνὰ δαιμόνια; 3) it deals so slightly with the charge of corrupting the young men that one is led to believe that Meletus had identified "corruption" with the teaching of irreligion.

Bury is not one of those who expect from Plato a verbatim

account of what Socrates said in his own defense. He is quite content to refer to the *Apology* as a "work of art" (p. 22), but like many who adopt this point of view he demands too much from the author and finds too little. To be a successful work of art it should contain in itself enough information about the whole case to let the reader infer with reasonable certainty what the accusers had to say in support of their charge and what Socrates said in reply. The author must, since he does not give an outline of the κατηγορία of the prosecutors, suggest "artistically" what their argument was and how effectively the accused defended himself. More than that we are hardly justified in demanding. Least of all are we justified in demanding that the author shall be more modern and professional in presenting the case and in supporting denials with testimony than the professional pleader or speech-writer would have been. Bonner has already shown ("Legal Setting of Plato's *Apology*," *Classical Philology*, III, 174 ff.) that Plato is not at all inferior in this respect to the contemporary lawyer.

Let us see, then, whether Plato has really omitted all that Bury thinks he has. In spite of Xenophon's pathetic attempt to establish the orthodoxy of his master, I find it hard to believe that Socrates made any save a mocking or ironical remark in support of his orthodoxy. He could obviously not say anything wholeheartedly on the subject. Far better it was to trap the prosecutor into identifying unorthodoxy with irreligion and to confute him on that ground, and to keep before the jury constantly his belief in God. It is this that the Platonic Socrates does. It is the *god* of Delphi who is responsible for his career in Athens (33 c, 20 e); the *God* cannot lie (21 b); one must take *God's* business seriously (21 e); only *God* is wise (23 a); it is in the attempt to assist *God* that he carries on his investigation in Athens (23 b c); he worships the sun and moon as all Athenians do (26 d); he must keep the place assigned him by *God* (28 e); he knows that it is wrong to disobey *God*, and he will obey him rather than the jurors (29 d); he is himself the gift of *God* to Athens (30 d), of the *God* that cares for the Athenians (31 a); his warning voice is of

God (31 d); he must not, when on trial, do what he considers impious (33 d), especially since he is on trial for impiety, because that would be acting as his accusers say, teaching disregard of *God* (35 d); he believes in *God*, as none of his accusers does, and leaves it with the jurors and with *God* to decide his case (35 d); he goes out to his death, his jurors to live, and which is the happier fate no one knows but *God* (42 a).⁴ It seems to me that this artistic arrangement is more effective than any "categorical denial," with or without testimony, and vastly more convincing than "I should like to know on what grounds Meletus asserts that I do not worship the gods worshipped by the city, for at public festivals I am seen sacrificing at the public altars and Meletus could have seen me if he had wished," from the Xenophontic *Apology* (11), which is surely not a work of art, and I hope not an accurate account of the proceedings.

On the subject of "religious novelties" Bury is surprisingly inaccurate. "In Plato's defense this is referred to only for the purpose of showing that it is inconsistent with the allegation that he did not acknowledge the gods, and no hint is given of the precise meaning of *καὶνὰ δαιμόνια*. Meletus, however, was absolutely bound to explain its meaning to justify the accusation. In Xenophon's defense, on the other hand, it is explained as meaning that Socrates professed to hear a divine voice which warned him what to do . . ." (p. 22). Bury has apparently overlooked *Apology* 31 c d, in which Plato's artistic explanation of the meaning of *καὶνὰ δαιμόνια* is introduced. His explanation is essentially the same as Xenophon's: "The reason for this [failure to participate in the Athenian government] you have often heard me state. I have a divine and superhuman [*δαιμόνιον*] something, which Meletus satirizes in this indictment. This I have had from childhood, a sort of voice it is, and when it comes to me it always dissuades me from doing what I may be on the point of doing." This seems to me to give a very broad "hint" indeed as to what Meletus had said in explanation of *καὶνὰ δαιμόνια*. Plato hardly

⁴ An impression of "orthodoxy" is created by the frequent identity of *ὁ θεός* with the "god of Delphi."

needed to be more specific, but he might have been so had he not already stated definitely in the *Euthyphro* that Meletus was attacking Socrates about "the familiar sign" (3 b).

Socrates devotes more time to the charge of corrupting young men than Bury admits. With it is involved the matter of teaching, and, in one form or another, the two appear constantly. Approximately one-third of the defense, about 6 Stephanus pages, deals with these points. The charge was vague and incapable of proof, and Socrates shrewdly takes advantage of that fact. He calls the jurors' attention to the failure of the prosecutors to produce in court any of those whom he has presumably corrupted, or their relatives, and challenges the accusers to take part of his time to present such evidence, if they have forgotten to do so (cf. Bonner, *op. cit.*, 173). He even suggests that the charge will be refuted by the witnesses he will offer — which I believe to be the interpretation of 34 a: "You will find that all are ready to assist me, their corruptor." Such skilful probing into the weak spot in the prosecutor's case hardly justifies the assertion that Socrates dealt "very slightly" with the charge of corruption. His first cross-examination of Meletus deals with this point; with this is connected the only reference in the *Apology* to the Socratic theory of the involuntary character of evil: "Either I do not corrupt them or, if I corrupt them, I do so involuntarily"; to refute the charge of corrupting the young men he gives the eloquent description of what he really does say to his associates, young and old, on the subject of virtue, closing with the defiant "if by saying such things I corrupt the young men, it would be indeed harmful, but if anyone says that I say anything else than this, he talks nonsense. This I shall continue to do, were I in danger of dying many times over" (30 b).

It is obviously true that the language of 26 b seems to justify one in assuming, as does Bury (p. 23), that Meletus had identified corrupting young men with the teaching of irreligion: "In what way do you assert that I corrupt the young men, Meletus? Or does the language of your indictment mean that you consider that I corrupt them by teaching them not to believe in the gods

in which the city believes?" It is the conviction of Bury and others that the accusers had made it perfectly clear before the trial was over that they believed that the corrupting influence of Socrates extended to the field of politics as well — and perhaps into other fields. To account for the absence of any reply to this point in the speech of Socrates, Bury has a novel solution. He believes that there is evidence that the prosecutors had arranged for Meletus to develop the charge of irreligion and Anytus that of corrupting the young men; that the Platonic *Apology* is a reply to Meletus only, who had so far been the only speaker. The evidence that Bury relies upon for this suggestion is obtained in an interesting way. Like Schanz, Dindorff, and others, he reconstructs from the *Apologia Socratis* of Libanius the tenor of what Anytus said at the trial. Perhaps this needs a word of explanation. About ten years after the death of Socrates there appeared from the pen of the Sophist Polycrates a *κατηγορία Σωκράτους*. It has been suggested that it was intended as a reply to Plato's *Gorgias*, in which Socrates is not very generous in his remarks about the political careers of the early Athenian statesmen, Themistocles, Pericles, and others. This rhetorical exercise of Polycrates purported to be the actual speech of Anytus delivered at the trial of Socrates. It has long ago disappeared, but its contents are known to us. It seems to have been rather generally accepted by the later ancients as being what it pretended to be, and in the fourth century of our era the rhetorician Libanius composed a reply to it as a rhetorical exercise. This *ἀπολογία Σωκράτους* is extant, and since it apparently replies closely to the various points in the denunciation of Polycrates we can from it reconstruct the substance of the latter. This does not give us any definite information as to the contents of the actual speech of Anytus, but it is only fair to assume that Polycrates followed it rather closely, no matter how much he may have added thereto. He may have been present at the trial and therefore acquainted with the main arguments of Anytus. What, then, do we learn from Libanius of the points that Anytus had stressed? Stripped of their rhetorical fulness they are: 1) That Socrates taught disrespect and irreverence for the

poets; 2) constantly criticized democracy and Athenian institutions; 3) encouraged young men to be ἀπράγμονες and to indulge in useless philosophical speculations. I confess that the results obtained from the dreary rhetoric of Libanius are disappointing to me. The rhetorician's commendable attempt to defend Socrates may be a reply to the denunciation of Anytus by Polycrates, but it might very well have been written by anyone who knew his Plato and Xenophon, and who realized to what extent Socrates was held responsible, in some quarters, for the careers of Alcibiades and Critias, how freely he criticized poets, democracy, and local Athenian institutions and customs, and how irritated Anytus had become with philosophers and the influence of the philosophical method upon young men (*Meno* 94 e).

It is, however, not my purpose to sneer at the smallness of the mouse produced by the laborious reading of Libanius, but to inquire whether scholars are right in suggesting that Plato's *Apology* is a reply to only one of his accusers and to only half of their argument. From the artistic point of view it seems to me impossible that such is the case. It is hardly credible that even Plato would have treated the actual trial in such a casual manner. However, arguments based on the vague and subjective interpretation of "artistic" are unsatisfactory and unconvincing, and it is fortunate that it is not necessary to depend on them. Socrates admits quite frankly in the *Apology* that he spent a great deal of his time questioning and criticizing poets and statesmen (21 c) and that his success in proving their ignorance had not added to his popularity; his criticism of the government of Athens and of democracy in general is far from veiled (31 d, 32 e); especially open is his denunciation of the usual procedure in the courts, the most characteristic of all Athenian institutions (34 c-35 c); his very confession and explanation of πολυπραγμοσύνη is itself offered to justify his political ἀπραγμοσύνη (31 c); he is ready enough to admit that he has many followers among the young and wealthy (23 c) who have nothing else to do and who consequently yield to the fascination that the Socratic method has for them and become embryo dialecticians; for their spiritual or

moral development he disclaims responsibility (33 b), which is but one form of denying the charge of corrupting young men; he recognizes quite well that his unpopularity is largely due to these young would-be Socratics, whose use of the ἔλεγχος has irritated poets, statesmen, and artisans. To use his own words: "Those who are examined by them become angry at me, not at themselves, and say 'Socrates is a despicable person and corrupts the young men.' And when they are asked what he does and what he teaches that corrupts them, they justify their assertions by accusing him of teaching irreligion" (23 d). Those subjected to cross-examination are enraged, then, not at his unorthodoxy or irreligion, but at the diabolical success that the young men have acquired from Socrates at upsetting their political convictions and their self-esteem. In the light of all this it seems to me that one is fully justified in saying that the Platonic *Apology* is the "artistic" presentation of a Socrates who realizes that he is accused of disrespect for poets and statesmen, and who explains how this impression got abroad; who is suspected of antidemocratic sympathies, and who defiantly explains what it is that he objects to in democracy in general and in Athens in particular; who has been accused either directly or indirectly of raising up a group of philosophical and political followers, and who disclaims any responsibility for ideas that the young men may get from him, but who smilingly admits that young men like to copy his dialectical method because it is not unpleasant to watch the victims squirm. These are essentially the points that the study of Libanius has led scholars to assume were the arguments advanced by Anytus, and my conviction is that, if they were, there is every reason for assuming that Anytus had spoken before Socrates delivered the speech that Plato reports.

One might perhaps reasonably argue that Plato chose to have Socrates reply to only a part of the charges of the prosecution, and to those that he considered most important or most easily answered; but it will not do to support such a theory by saying, as does Professor Bury, that "the advocates Anytus and Lycon have not yet spoken. It is natural to infer that they spoke after

Socrates. Socrates did not employ advocates; if he had they would have replied to Anytus and Lycon." Such an arrangement would be manifestly unfair to the defense, and in any case is not in accord with Athenian procedure, which demanded, as Lipsius says, *dass die Beistände sofort nach dem ersten Vertreter der Partei zu sprechen hatten* (*Das Attische Recht*, 910). Any other arrangement would have caused the timekeepers considerable difficulty. Since each side was supposed to have an equal share of the time allowed for the case, it would have been extremely awkward to empty the clepsydra after Meletus had finished, fill it for Socrates, empty it again, if he did not take up the allotted time, and fill it for Anytus and Lyco, with especial care that the amount of water allowed the three prosecutors should equal that allowed Socrates. This is not an insurmountable obstacle, but, as I have just pointed out, Athenian practice would have compelled the advocates to speak immediately after Meletus,⁵ and Meletus might have said at the conclusion of his speech what Dinarchus said in concluding his speech *vs.* Demosthenes: παραδίδωμι τὸ ὕδωρ τοῖς ἄλλοις κατηγοροῖς (114).

So much for general practice. The evidence from the *Apology* is conclusive enough. Socrates repeatedly refers to the words of his accusers (plural) and gives no indication that he is at all uninformed what their form of attack is. More than that, he refers directly to the words of Anytus. The latter is quoted as having said that either Socrates should have been ignored entirely, or else he should be put to death now that he has been brought to trial; that all the young men would be corrupted if Socrates is not put out of the way (29 c). In reply to this Socrates declares that he is not at all concerned about the possible effect of such arguments from Anytus, since he cannot give up his God-given career even at the threat of death. This can only mean that Anytus has already spoken and that when Socrates addressed the jury the case for the prosecution was complete.

⁵ In the prosecution of Aristogiton, Demosthenes delivered his speech as συνήγορος immediately after the main speech by Lycurgus (*Dem.* 25.1).

JANUS CUSTOS BELLI

By JOHN BRIDGE
The College of the City of New York

No one who reads the well-known descriptions of the gates of War in the first and seventh books of the *Aeneid* can fail to puzzle over the significance of these lines. How is one to account for the fact that these gates, the doors of the temple of Janus Geminus in the Forum, were left open in time of war and closed only when peace reigned throughout the empire? The obvious and generally accepted answer, that the gates were closed to imprison War or the devils of War within the temple, offers serious difficulties when one stops to consider the true nature of the god Janus and his temple. For how did it come to pass that Janus, the god of doors and passageways, came to be associated with war at all? To answer this it is necessary to cast a glance backward into the remote past and see what were the original functions of Janus.

At the present time there can be no doubt that Janus was primarily the god who presided over doors and archways (*jani*).¹ Recent authorities, Wissowa, Peter in Roscher's *Lexicon*, and Fowler are all agreed on this point. His cult titles, Quirinus and Curiatius, are now believed to refer to the adoption of his cult by the state and by the curiae and to have no significance in regard to his nature.² Furthermore, the rudimentary nature of his temple in the Forum bears out this interpretation. The earliest, and only, art representation, on the coins of Nero,³ with the

¹ Wissowa, *Religion und Cultus der Roemer*, 2 ed., Munich, 1912, pp. 103 ff.; Roscher, W. H., ed. *Ausfuehrliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Roemischen Mythologie*; Fowler, W. W., *Roman Festivals*, London, 1908, pp. 282-290.

² Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 290.

³ Cohen, *Monnaies² Néron*, 153, 161, 178, 183.

description given by Procopius⁴ in the sixth century of our era, show that this temple consisted merely of two gates connected by walls. The small inclosure thus formed was open to the sky, and within it stood a cult statue of the god. It was, then, nothing but a double gateway; and that, in this form, it was still used as a passageway is attested by an epigram of Martial.⁵ That its dual character was due merely to the fact that a gate had of necessity a front and a back, is shown by Wissowa.⁶

Such, then, was the nature of the god. Where, we ask, was his temple? As to the general location of this, with which alone we are concerned, there can be no doubt. Though there were many Janus arches in the city⁷ there was one alone which was recognized as being the god's own particular temple. And this temple we know from the complete agreement of ancient authors stood in the lower part of the Argiletum, that is, in the northeast part of the Forum, a little in front of the Curia,⁸ though no traces of this temple have as yet been discovered.⁹

This location of the temple has led to many interesting conjectures as to its origin, which, ingenious as they may be, fail on one important point; that is, they cannot explain why it was that the gates of the temple were left open in time of war. For example, A. Schneider¹⁰ sought to identify the temple with the Porta Janualis, a gate in the fortification of the Septimontium city. He holds, with Roscher, that the passage in the seventh *Aeneid* can mean only that in time of war the general led the entire army out through this gate,¹¹ and to support this theory of the function of the gate he quotes Lydus, *De Mensibus*, and Suidas.¹² But

⁴ Procopius *Bellum Gothicum* i. 25.

⁵ Martial x. 28. 3 ff.

⁶ Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

⁷ Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, p. 287; Ovid *Fasti* i. 257, *Cum tot sint jani, cur stas sacratus in uno?*

⁸ Huelsen, *Roman Forum*, N. Y., 1909, p. 138; Platner, *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*, Boston, 1911; for ancient authors (pp. 190-191).

⁹ Platner, *op. cit.*

¹⁰ A. Schneider, *Mittheilungen des Kaiserlichen Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts*, Roemische Abteilung, 1895, pp. 172-178.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 175, 176.

¹² *Ib.*

Schneider himself admits that a weakness lies in the fact that such a gate should normally be closed and not perpetually open in time of war, and he fails to answer this objection.¹³

Again, Professor H. W. Wright,¹⁴ following the conjecture of Professor N. W. DeWitt,¹⁵ seeks to explain the origin of the temple as the entrance gate to the king's courtyard, in which, according to this theory, the Forum had its origin. But he too fails to account for the opening and closing of the doors in time of war and peace. For, as stated above, such a gate would have to be shut when the city was at war; and again, the connection of Janus with war in all probability goes back to a time before that of the kings, in whose relatively civilized era such a courtyard might have existed.

But if the Janus temple as a gate of war was not a city gate or an entrance to the royal courtyard, what was it? To my mind it was not an entrance proper at all, but, following the suggestion of Schneider, it was a simple *janus* or arch through which the Roman army marched as a means of magic purification. That arches of such a nature were used by the Romans we may assume from the stories of the "Tigillum Sororium" and the "Porta Triumphalis," which I propose to discuss briefly.¹⁶

The story of the Tigillum Sororium as told in Livy i. 26 is well known. A certain Horatius, after being legally exonerated of the charge of murdering his sister, was compelled to pass beneath a beam set in the street walls (*transmisso per viam tigillo*), after certain purificatory sacrifices had been made, *ut caedes manifesta aliquo tamen piaculo lueretur*. This, of course, is clearly an instance of purification by means of passage.¹⁷ Its particular interest for us lies in the fact that of the two altars beneath the

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

¹⁴ H. W. Wright, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1925, pp. 79-81.

¹⁵ DeWitt, *CLASSICAL JOURNAL*, XIV, pp. 483 ff.

¹⁶ The conception of the Janus temple as an arch of purification is suggested but not developed by H. J. Rose in his book, *Primitive Culture in Italy*, London, 1926, p. 48.

¹⁷ W. W. Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations*, Oxford, 1920, pp. 71-72.

beam one was dedicated to Janus Curiatius,¹⁸ and that later writers generally interpret it as a primitive *janus* arch.¹⁹ Festus, moreover, states that this beam had originally rested on two other beams,²⁰ though, as Fowler states, this is probably pure conjecture on his part.²¹

Now Fowler, starting with this Tigillum Sororium and comparing it with the Porta Triumphalis, which will be discussed later, holds that the sending of a conquered army under the yoke was a rite of purification of the same nature.²² That is, the conquering army, that it might return home without fear of the conquered left behind, sought to remove the bad magic of the latter by a rite of passage. That such a rite was not peculiar to the Romans, but common to the people of that part of the world, is suggested by H. J. Rose,²³ who cites Caesar's *Gallic War* i. 7 to show that it was practiced by the Helvetians.

Let us now turn to the Porta Triumphalis. This was an arch or gateway through which a victorious army had to pass before entering the city. No remains of this arch are preserved, but its general location is clear. It stood in the Campus Martius, very probably close to the Ara Martis, that is, just north of the modern Piazza del Gesu.²⁴ In other words, it was an arch standing outside of the city and not connected with the city walls. The exact appearance of this arch is unknown, as we have neither description nor representation of it. But Fowler²⁵ refers us to the arch of Augustus at Rimini, which shows two upright Corinthian pillars with an architrave laid across them, within which is built an arch proper. The inference is obvious; the Porta Triumphalis was in origin a simple *janus* of just such

¹⁸ Dionysius of Halicarnassus iii. 22. 7; Aurelius Victor 4. 9; Lydus *De Mensibus* 4. 1.

¹⁹ Festus, s.v. *Sororium tigillum*; Roscher, *Lex.* 21.

²⁰ Festus, *op. cit.*

²¹ Fowler, *op. cit.*

²² Fowler, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

²³ H. J. Rose, *Primitive Culture*, p. 46 ff.

²⁴ Platner, *Rom. Top.*, p. 346; Cicero *In Pisonem* 55; Josephus *Bellum Judaicum* vii. 5. 4.

²⁵ Fowler, *Rom. Essays*, p. 73.

a character as the *iugum* or, if the conjecture of Festus is correct, the Tigillum Sororium. It is Fowler's opinion that this arch was used for the purification of returning armies. It is interesting to note that Sir James Frazer arrived independently at just the same conclusion.²⁶ Frazer, moreover, quotes Pliny the elder²⁷ to show that the Romans themselves felt the need of purification from the taint of bloodshed after a battle. For Pliny cites Masurius as his authority for the statement that the laurel worn by the soldiers in triumphal procession was intended to purge them from the slaughter of the enemy, *quia suffimentum sit caedis hostium et purgatio*.

And now let us return to the Janus Geminus of the Forum. In my opinion this temple was in origin nothing but an early appearance of the Porta Triumphalis. It is well known that the Forum was not a part of the early city but stood outside the walls of Roma Quadrata and the Septimontium city.²⁸ The site, therefore, of the Janus temple, with reference to the early city, agrees relatively with the position of the later Porta Triumphalis. When the city expanded and the Forum was included within the city walls, a new triumphal gate would clearly have to be erected outside the limits of the new city. The old arch, however, would be left standing in its original position. Through its very nature it would be a sacred object; and what is more natural than to assume that, deprived of its original function, it should acquire a new use, that is, that it should become the temple of the god of that which it was — Janus? In time gates would be added to the arch, but the tradition of its gateless days, when it was the arch through which the armies marched, might well linger on and give rise to a popular conception of a temple whose doors were open when War was abroad in the land and within whose close the devils of War were imprisoned when peace finally reigned.

²⁶ J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, London, 1923, Vol. XI, p. 194.

²⁷ Pliny *Nat. Hist.* xv. 135.

²⁸ Huelsen-Carter, *The Roman Forum*, p. 3.

Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent direct to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

MISCELLANEA HOMERICA, VI

The stock of the Lost Continent, Atlantis, has had a good market lately. It used to be the fashion merely to jeer at the notion of its existence. That can hardly continue now that Mr. Lewis Spence has examined the evidence at length in *The Problem of Atlantis*, *Atlantis in America*, and *The History of Atlantis* (London, 1924-5-6), and comes to the conclusion that there once was such a continent out in the Atlantic. It is now the turn of the sceptics. Again, in France there is a *Société d'Études Atlantéennes*; I have seen a program of its recent meetings, for discussion of such subjects as *L'Atlantide et le traditions celtiques* and *basques*. In German geographical literature the quest is frequently mentioned. No. LXXIII (1927) of *Petermann's Mitteilungen* would appear to be what might be called a special "Atlantis number."

But what's Atlantis to Homer? Only this, that among the many strange places where Atlantis has been found — Spitzbergen, Nigeria, the Caucasus, Ceylon, and others — is the Scheria of the *Odyssey*. This last identification, it may be recalled, goes back to Donnelly. On p. 298 of his *Atlantis: the Antediluvian World* (1852) he says, "the description of the Phaeacian walls, harbors, ships, etc., seems like a recollection of Atlantis." More recently the late Mr. Frost argued in *J. H. S.*, XXXIII, 189 ff. that Plato's Atlantis was really Minoan Crete, and that the Odyssean account of Scheria is a reflection of Crete in the days of its greatness. In this he was followed by Leaf in *Homer and History*, 183 f. These suggestions are negatived by Mr. Spence. See also *C. Q.*, XIII, 8 f.

Richard Hennig, in his *Von rätselhaften Ländern* (Munich, 1925), goes farther and in the first two essays in the book — "Atlantis und Tartessos" and "Das Phäakenland Scheria" proclaims that Atlantis

is Tartessos, and Tartessos Scheria. He relies on Schulten's *Tartessos* (Hamburg, 1922). Schulten does not share the Scheria view, but he considers Tartessos the oldest *Kulturstadt* in Europe, and thinks it may have been a colony from the east, perhaps from Minoan Crete, and that is far from improbable. On the antiquity of navigation to the far west Mr. Cary says in *J. H. S.*, XLIV, 168, quoting authorities — Schulten among them — "the sea passage to the tin lands, as an abundance of evidence proves, was already made in prehistoric times."

In *Petermann's Mitteilungen*, 1926, and in the *Rhein-Mus.* for the same year, Hennig insists that Corfu cannot be Scheria. He also expresses the opinion that without ἐξωκεανισμός — the word is Strabo's, and means going (like Matthew Arnold's grave Tyrian trader) "outside the western straits To where the Atlantic raves" — there can be no proper understanding of the Wanderings of Odysseus.

But Hennig's argumentation is far from convincing. The modern literature of the subject other than German is but little regarded, in the essay on Scheria in his books not at all. A discussion of the whereabouts of Scheria which omits reference to its equation to Corfu in Bérard's great work cannot be considered complete. There is much to be said for Bérard's conclusion. Reference may be made to two papers in *C. Q.*, XIII, 8 ff., and two in *C. P.*, XIII, 321 ff. and XIV, 97 ff. In these, it may be added, the old fairyland view of Scheria was examined and rejected. But it dies hard. It is constantly accepted by writers on the Homeric geography and dissectors of the *Odyssey*, who neglect all that has been said against it since Welcker propounded it in a well-known paper in the first number of the *Rhein. Mus.* It is comforting to find that the German geographers named above are satisfied as to the reality of Scheria.

Edwin Björkman, in *The Search for Atlantis* (New York, 1927), described as "excursions by a layman among old legends and new discoveries," follows Schulten and Hennig. It is a readable but slender treatise and does not show great acquaintance with the literature of Scheria. For the identification of Scheria with Tartessos much is made of the tide at the latter. When the river god stays his current to allow Odysseus to land, this must refer to a change of tide from ebb. There is no tide at Corfu, there is at Tartessos, so Corfu cannot and Tartessos must be Scheria. But the Homeric gods πάντα δύνανται, and the tidal inference is not inevitable.

In a somewhat ambitious paper in the *Zeitschr. für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, 1926, Albert Herrmann, after one more rearrangement of the corpus of the *Odyssey*, insists on the importance of Homer for the geography of Greece. All that concerns us here is that Scheria is now located in Tunisia. — Since this was written I see from the *Phil. Wocht.*, for 1928, 254, that Scheria has been found in Socotra in the Arabian Sea.

Meantime yet another turn has been given to the discussion by Hennig in the *Geogr. Zeitschr.*, XXIII (reported in *Phil. Wocht.*, 1927, 564). Corfu cannot be Scheria, because Corfu is the Ithaka of the *Odyssey*! The home of Odysseus, as πολυπλάνητος as its king, has been found in S. Maura, in Cephalonia, in the Aegadean Islands, and now in Corfu. *Quousque tandem!* There are still some islands in the Aegean that can be pressed into service.

Scheria is Corfu, as ancient tradition knew. It was the last port of call on the voyagings of the Minoans to the far west, and probably a Minoan settlement. Its remoteness, as described in the *Odyssey*, means only this, that it was outside the Achaean world. For Achaeans, Ithaka was the last port of call within their realm in similar voyagings. The accuracy of the Homeric geography is more and more assured as the years pass. For that we have in large measure to thank the discussion that has been the outcome of Dörpfeld's persistence in his Leukas-Ithaka heresy.

A. SHEWAN

ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND

THE HISTORY OF AN INTERESTING WORD

Habent sua fata libelli. So, too, have many words had their "fate" in the history of human speech. Of humble parentage, words may, like the *homo novus*, suddenly rise to popular favor. The student of New Testament Greek recalls χάρις, αἵρεσις, κύριος, πίστις, and even ἡ γραφή. Words make history; one such is λόγιον.

In the Classics, for instance, λόγιον is simply synonymous with χρησμός and stands for "oracle" in its broadest sense. Thucydides and Aristophanes have familiarized us with it. Taken over by the Septuagint, it sheds all pagan connotations of tripods, adyta, and pagan deities. Being only the diminutive of λόγος, it is quite at home in its new environment, doing duty for "divine utterance." Its brother

χρησιμὸς could not cast off its radical association with "consultations" and so is eschewed in the Old and New Testaments.

Eusebius, as Heikel records, employs the singular of λόγιον for "oracle, prophecy, and Scripture text." And more recent research has proved that the Eusebian formula τὰ θεῖα λόγια or τὰ ἱερὰ λόγια is but a synonym of ἡ γραφή and τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, the normal terms in use for Scripture; other variants used in the fourth and fifth centuries being οἱ ἱεροὶ λόγοι, θεῖος λόγος, and even ὁ λόγος. But I am anticipating.

The Septuagint selected λόγια rather than χρησμοί (restored to honor by Eusebius) to mark "divine sayings." When they further qualify it by definite article and descriptive genitive, θεοῦ or κυρίου, it becomes "The Oracular words of God" in their collective aspect. It only needed the play of metonymy to turn "God's Oracular Words" into the definite collection of sayings recorded in the sacred books. Hence in Philo and Josephus we find τὰ ἱερὰ λόγια and τὰ λόγια αὐτῶν (i.e., Ἑβραίων) functioning as synonymous with ἡ γραφή, Scripture. Nevertheless in the Old Testament, the New Testament, and very early documents like the *Epistula Clementis Romani*, τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ or τοῦ κυρίου must not be equated with Scripture. Rather does the expression correspond with what is commonly designated "God's Word" or "Divine Revelation," with just a connotation of the containing books.

Many British critics, however, interpret Papias' σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων not as Gospel, but as "an orderly arrangement of the Lord's discourses." They go farther and claim that the λόγια κυριακά, which they render "The Lord's Discourses," constitute the *Logian Document*, strangely supposed to have been handled and used by Papias. Another school, however, claims that this was a *Manual of Prophecies* (Gregory) or of *Testimonies* (Harris and Burkitt) in use among the earliest evangelists and utilized by subsequent Gospel-compilers. German scholars more cautiously adhere to the designation "Source Q = Quelle." The latter is famous as the chief, if hypothetical, documents in the Two-Source Theory of the Synoptic Problem.

Readers of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL who are interested in this lexicographical study will profitably turn to a booklet entitled "The Logia in Ancient and Recent Literature" by J. Donovan, M.A. (publ. by W. Heffer, Cambridge, England, 1924) and its two supplements ("Note on the Eusebian Use of Logia," *Biblica*, July, 1926; and

"The Word Scripture and its Synonyms" in *Irish Eccles. Record*, May, 1927). Here we have the complete story of the word *logion* in its Jewish and Christian sense, and a discussion of all the passages where the term *Logia of the Lord* or *Logia of God* is known to occur in both Testaments, in the Apostolic Fathers, and in other Church writers down to and including Eusebius. Even Origen, Pseudo-Dionysius, and some later Byzantine writers have not been forgotten.

In recent years the study of early Christian origins has suffered somewhat from the free use, or misuse, of this very word *logia*. It is therefore a pleasure to follow the author of the pamphlet and articles mentioned through a labyrinth of texts and, guided by him, emerge with the conviction that the precise import of this significant term has now to all intents and purposes been clarified. The reader will understand the importance of an investigation of this kind if he bears in mind that the ramifications of the word *logion* extend from questions bearing on the authenticity of Mark and Matthew to the identification of that mysterious personage so often heard of as "John the Elder." Professor Bacon's drastic condemnation of the term *Logian Document*, and his admission that the *Matthaean Logia* mentioned by Papias are nothing but Matthew's Gospel, seem to have made little impression. In the light of Donovan's researches the supporters of the theory on which rests the title *Logian Document* have reason to re-examine the grounds of their belief. Observe that *logia* never meant ἐντολαί, "commandments." The wise student will cling to the older designation, "Source Q = Quelle." I may add that the author has not entered into the question whether Source Q really existed or not, or whether, as Burkitt has surmised, it consisted of several documents. He merely insists that σύνταξις means treatise or book (if the Lord's revelation), not a *collection*, made by Matthew, of His sayings.

JAMES A. KLEIST

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY

POISONED ARROWS IN HOMER

There is no doubt that the Greeks knew of the use of poisoned arrows: the very word *toxic*, τοξικὸν φάρμακον, is sufficient proof of this. There is one slight trace of this found in Homer in the false story told by Mentes-Athena to Telemachus, that Odysseus had once gone abroad in search of poison for his arrows. The bearing of that story is discussed by me in the *JOURNAL*, XIX, 240 f.

No trace of poison is found in the action of either poem, and there is absolute proof that no such a thing was even feared or suspected. Book iv of the *Iliad* tells the tale of the treacherous shot made by Pandarus in violation of a solemn truce that had just been ratified by both the Greeks and the Trojans. When Agamemnon saw that Menelaus had been wounded he fell into complete despair and felt certain that his brother would die. Menelaus too was in great fear, but when he looked towards the wound and saw that the barbs of the arrowhead and the cord around the head of the shaft had not entered his body, he was delighted, for he knew he was in no danger of his life, and he called to his brother: "Be of good cheer, do not alarm needlessly the host of the Achaeans, for the missile has not gone deep enough to do me great hurt." Had there been the slightest suspicion of anyone's making use of poison, Menelaus would surely have assumed that a man base enough to violate an oath would not have hesitated to make use of it; but such a thought did not occur to him, nor did it enter the fears of his suspicious brother, Agamemnon.

When Diomedes was shot by an arrow which went so deep into his shoulder that it could be removed only by being drawn completely through (*Iliad* v. 112), that hero had no fear of poison, but he continued in the thick of the fight, not even taking time to have the wound dressed, and later (xi. 377) when an arrow went right through his foot, Diomedes taunted the archer by saying that he had done little more than scratch the flat of his foot, and he never showed the least fear that the arrow might have carried poison.

The fact that in all Homer not a single person wounded by an arrow suffers from poison or shows the least fear of it seems to me to prove that the Homeric warriors had had no experience with that method of warfare. Agamemnon would certainly have suspected poison as well as treachery had he conceived of poison as possible. The absence of fear of poison is not the work of expurgation of a few passages, but is universal throughout the combat scenes of both poems.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., for territory covered by the Associations of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; George Howe, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, for the Southeastern States; Walter Miller, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southwestern States; and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Miss Julianne A. Roller, Franklin High School, Portland, Ore., and to Mr. Walter A. Edwards, Los Angeles High School, Los Angeles, Cal. This department will present everything that is properly news—but considerations of space compel the editors to ask that items be made as brief as possible.]

Dictionary of Late Medieval British Latin

We reprint parts of a circular which is intended partly as a report of progress, partly as an appeal for the assistance of competent scholars:

The Dictionary of Late Medieval British Latin is a comparatively new enterprise. The work on it was started in the year 1924 in England and since that date has made considerable progress. It is to contain Latin words found in British sources of the period 1066 to 1600. In contrast to the new Du Cange it is to embody only medieval Latin words and classical words used in an unclassical sense.

The assembling of words for the Dictionary is directed by Committee B, Dictionary of Medieval Latin, which English committee acts with the authorization of the British Academy. The American committee was appointed late in the year 1924 by the American Council of Learned Societies and was named Committee on a Dictionary of Late Medieval British Latin. Its members are: Professors G. H. Gerould (Princeton), W. E. Lunt (Haverford), N. Neilson (Mount Holyoke), J. S. P. Tatlock (Harvard), J. F. Willard (Colorado), and G. E. Woodbine (Yale). Professor Willard is chairman of the committee.

During the first year the American committee confined its attention to the preparation of Directions to Readers, to the formulation of an announcement, and to the drawing up of lists of readers and of works to be read. Early in the year 1926 the first requests for co-operation were issued and a few volunteer readers enlisted. Since that time sixty-five individuals have offered their services. The English committee reported in March, 1927, that fifty-four works had been completed and that the Scottish committee had sixteen readers on its list. When the report was made about fifty thousand slips had been

assembled. Since then the number has been greatly increased. At the present writing (January 23, 1928) one hundred and seven works of various kinds have been completed in England, Scotland, and America, and sixty-seven are being read.

The American committee is now faced with the problem of how to enlist more readers for the Dictionary. There are hundreds of books and collections of documents to be read. There are also many competent readers who have not offered their services. In an enterprise of this sort not only the good will but also the active co-operation of many individuals is necessary.

Further information about the Dictionary and the work to be done may be obtained from James F. Willard, 1101 Aurora Avenue, Boulder, Colorado.

The American Academy in Rome, School of Classical Studies

The Summer Session enrollment for 1928 on February 25 was 43, and represented California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin. There are still a few places: address Summer Session, 410 North Butler Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

The regular session of the School of Classical Studies, 1928-9, will have as professor in charge Professor Henry A. Sanders. The annual professor will be Professor Frederick W. Shipley.

Classical Conference at the University of Iowa

The outstanding feature of the tenth annual Classical Conference at the State University of Iowa, on February 10 and 11, was the Ter-octo-centennial of the *Persians* of Aeschylus. In the afternoon Professor Roy C. Flickinger lectured on "The Meaning of the *Persians*" and in the evening the play was performed in English by a student cast directed by Professor Vance M. Morton, of the Department of Speech.

The guests of honor of the Conference from outside the state were Professor Louis E. Lord, of Oberlin College, and Professor A. M. Rovelstad, of Northfield, Minnesota. The former delivered three addresses entitled "Excavations in the Athenian Agora," "Caesar and Cleopatra," and "Third Year Latin"; and the latter, two addresses dealing with "Valerius Maximus as a Mirror of Roman Life and Thought" and "A Syntactical Test in Latin Word Order."

The colleges of Iowa were represented by Professor Sherman Kirk, of Drake University, who spoke on "The Value of Greek for Religious Workers"; Professor John M. Bridgham, of Grinnell College, on "Our Grammatical

Nomenclature"; Professor George W. Bryant, of Coe College, on "Some Latin Problems of the College Freshman"; and Professor Mark E. Hutchinson, of Cornell College, on "The Correlation between the Difficulty of Latin Constructions and their Frequency in High School Latin."

Speakers from high schools were Mrs. Flora I. Godsey, of Emporia, Kansas, who spoke on "Reminiscences of a Latin Teacher" and "Classical Translations and Adaptations"; Mrs. Margaret A. Pratt, of Fort Dodge, Iowa, on "The Value of Latin Clubs"; Mrs. Ruth Farnham Ullrick, of Shenandoah, on "Making them Like It and Learn It"; Miss Lucile Powell, of Cedar Rapids, on "The Teaching of Latin Prose Composition"; and Miss Nellie E. Wilson, of Des Moines, on "A Summer in Italy."

From the University staff there were addresses by Professor Richard P. Baker, of the Department of Mathematics, on "The Greek Mathematical Mind"; Professor Forest Chester Ensign, of the Department of Education, on "The Educational Value of Latin"; and Dr. Helen M. Eddy, of the University High School, on "Some Recent Elementary Texts." Members of the classical faculty delivered papers as follows: Professor Earl LeV. Crum, on "The Laboratory Method of Teaching Latin"; Professor Roy C. Flickinger, on "The Direct Method at Close Range"; Professor F. H. Potter, on "Conservatives and Progressives in Latin Teaching"; Dr. Louisa V. Walker, on "The Descriptive Art of Vergil"; and Miss Helen R. Clifford, on "A Latin Cross Word Puzzle."

Eta Sigma Phi Convention

The National Convention of Eta Sigma Phi will be held at the University of Iowa, Iowa City, April 27 and 28. Among the speakers will be Professor R. J. Bonner, of the University of Chicago; Dean S. E. Stout, of Indiana University; Professor R. C. Flickinger, of the University of Iowa; and Professor Hardin Craig, of the Department of English in the University of Iowa. This honorary society of college classical students has had a rapid growth in its four years of existence, having now twenty-seven chapters. Petitions from several colleges and universities are now being considered and will be acted on at the convention.

Book Reviews

Five Roman Emperors: Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan; A.D. 69-117. By BERNARD W. HENDERSON. Cambridge: The University Press, 1927. Pp. xiii + 357. 21 shillings net.

This volume fills a gap in the author's preceding works,¹ which now form a continuous history of Rome from the accession of Nero to the death of Hadrian. The series constitutes a work of unusual interest and merit, solid in scholarship and written in an exceptionally vivid and fascinating style. However much one may be inclined to question some of the author's conclusions — and questions have been raised — his views are always supported by reasons and evidence and are therefore always worthy of careful consideration.

In the part of this work dealing with the Flavians emphasis is thrown almost exclusively on the frontier policy of the emperors, and their government in Rome is dismissed in a few pages. Few will probably be disposed to deny that this emphasis is in itself just and reasonable. The older school of historians fixed their attention far too much upon the narrow circle of the senatorial nobility, almost forgetting that there was a vast empire outside Rome and that the character of an emperor could not be fairly estimated solely by his relations with a small aristocratic class in the capital without reference to what he did or failed to do for the world at large. In recent years the provinces have come into their own and have received an increasing measure of attention. While commending this general tendency the reviewer cannot but feel that it has sometimes been carried too far. It is rarely possible to separate entirely the different parts of a ruler's policy, for they usually interact upon one another. However weak the senate as a body may have been, its members formed the governing class in the early Empire, and their attitude toward the emperor can hardly have been wholly without meaning and importance. One would suspect that this might be especially true

¹ *Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, London, 1903; *Civil War and Rebellion in the Roman Empire*, London, 1908; *Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian*, London, 1923.

in the period of the Flavians, and it seems to the reviewer that their policy in Rome is dismissed with undue brevity. The striking change in the character of the senate under them surely merits fuller discussion than the bare mention of it on page 169, and it may have had some bearing on the policy of absolutism adopted by the new dynasty.

Nevertheless, although more might perhaps have been done in certain directions, the work is of real and unquestionable value. If in the first part attention is concentrated on the frontiers, it is in this quarter that the achievements of the Flavians have been shrouded in the greatest obscurity. Our literary sources tell us little, and it is only in recent years that the spade of the archaeologist has supplied us with a large amount of new, and sometimes perplexing, material. Of this the author presents a clear and excellent summary, which is all the more welcome as most of it has hitherto been buried in voluminous German publications and therefore not easily accessible to the English reader. Concerning Vespasian and Domitian we are told (p. 85) that "it is one main purpose of this book to narrate, as fully as the meager evidence allows, the work on the European frontiers of these two great Emperors of Rome," and the task thus set has been admirably carried out. Not all scholars will agree with some of the judgments pronounced on points still involved in controversy, but attention is called to the various theories that have been advanced, and references are given which will enable those who wish to examine the evidence for themselves. That the discoveries due to the excavations along the Roman frontier in Germany have, or at least should have, considerably modified previous estimates of Domitian seems fully established; but the author goes, perhaps, too far in calling him the "greatest of the Flavian princes" (p. 116). In spite of the solid achievements which must now be set down to the credit of the "misjudged, disparaged, hated Domitian" (p. 116), it still seems to the reviewer that the work of Vespasian in restoring peace and order to a distracted world constitutes a better claim to that title than anything accomplished by his son.

The treatment of the domestic policy of Nerva and Trajan is much fuller and more adequate, and the picture of the general conditions in the empire during the period is very well done. Fortunately the great work of Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, appeared in time for the author to make extensive

use of it, but his discussion of these aspects of the subject is independent and judicious. The wars and campaigns of Trajan are narrated as clearly as the nature of the evidence will allow.

Here and there occur generalizations which seem to need qualification, or further explanation at least. It may be true that it was the absolutism of the Roman emperors which cast a blight upon the arts which alone seem to make life worth living, and that these arts withered away because of it (p. 38); and military autocracy may also have been responsible for "the monstrosities of Berlin architecture, the lumpishness of Prussian sculpture, the failure of poetry, the clumsy style, the lack of imagination in literature and scholarship" (p. 39) in modern Germany; but one is left wondering why absolutism failed to produce such results in France under Louis XIV. Moreover, if military autocracy has so fatal an effect, how could the protest even of a von Uhde suffice to redeem "the tawdriness and soullessness of modern German painting" (p. 39)? Clearly this explanation of the intellectual decline under the Empire requires some elucidation before it can be accepted as quite adequate and satisfactory.

But, though the reader may at times feel doubts as to certain conclusions, he will find this volume an important contribution to our knowledge of the period treated, on which it throws much new and welcome light. If it is less fascinating and vivid than the author's other works, this is not due to any failure of his unusual literary gifts, but to the fact that the nature of the subjects discussed and the character of the evidence under consideration combine to give less scope to them.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

FRANK BURR MARSH

The Harvard Tests. Latin Vocabulary (Forms A, B, C, D, E), Latin Morphology (Forms A, B, C, D, E), Latin Syntax (Forms A, B). By ALEXANDER INGLIS. Ginn & Co., 1927. 48c per form, 30 copies.

Each of the Harvard tests on Latin vocabulary, Latin morphology, and Latin syntax comes to the teacher in pads of thirty copies, with a description of the test, directions for giving and scoring it, a correction key, and a blank for the class record. All of the tests are intended for Latin pupils in all years of secondary Latin study, from beginners to those completing the fourth year, and each is

devised for use within one ordinary class period. They are available in several forms, so that the teacher may test frequently and watch progress; and one of the tests, that on vocabulary, is standardized for pupils who have had from four months to four years of Latin, so that the teacher is able to compare the median and interquartile range of his classes with the standards.

The basic assumption in the construction of all the tests has been that the value of a Latin word, form, or construction is in proportion to its usefulness, and that its usefulness is in proportion to the frequency with which it is used in secondary-school Latin. The author takes for his definition of secondary-school Latin what we have come to call the "traditional content," viz., the first four books of Caesar's *Gallie War*, the usual six orations of Cicero, and Vergil's *Aeneid*, the first six books; however, to anticipate the objection that this content is no longer the standard one, he states in each case that the values thus derived would not be changed materially if other classical authors were involved. Accordingly, the author has given to each word, form, and construction a scoring value depending on frequency, with the result that in the vocabulary test *non* is worth 40 points, *glacies* only 3; in the morphology test, the accusative singular of *regnum* is worth 48, the gerundive feminine nominative singular of *finis* only 11, and the superlative ablative plural masculine of *similis* only 3; and in the syntax test the subject nominative gets 300, the dative of the indirect object 22, the subjunctive with verbs of fearing only 1.

Isolated words or forms, chosen by sampling, furnish the material of two tests. In the vocabulary test, 150 Latin words from Lodge's *Vocabulary of High School Latin* are listed, and the pupil is asked to give one English meaning of each. In the morphology test, the pupil is asked to identify or supply 81 forms chosen on the basis of statistics in Byrne's *Syntax of High School Latin*, supplemented by investigations of the author. In the syntax test, the pupil is asked to identify (by naming case, mood, tense, name of construction, etc.) 31 substantive constructions and 29 verbal constructions chosen from Byrne. The syntax test provides for proportionate credit, in the other two an answer is either right or wrong in its entirety.

In general, the tests are valuable in that they present a convenient, objective, thoroughly worked out method of testing high-school Latin classes. On the other hand, this reviewer, at least, would prefer

to test for vocabulary and morphology not with isolated words, but with the words used in sentences. As for the basic assumption that frequency is all-important, that seems open to question. To say, for example, that a knowledge of the meaning of *et* is "about twenty-one hundred times as valuable as a knowledge of the word *impar*" is to overstate the matter a little. A knowledge of the meaning of *impar* might possibly mean a knowledge of the meaning of the negative prefix *in*, familiarity with the phenomenon of assimilation in prefixes, and a knowledge of the meaning of the root word *par*, which is of far more importance for English derivation, at least, than *et* — all this, though *impar*, by accident perhaps, does not happen to occur often in the "traditional course" in high-school Latin. Further, it seems rather too bad that a student who masters a difficult word or form should receive so very much less credit for that than for identifying correctly an extremely simple word or form which is of greater frequency. Other factors, then, such as importance for English, difficulty, etc., might well be considered in the making of such tests.

However, we are, after all, only feeling our way step by step in this new field of the Latin test; and many teachers will agree that the Harvard Latin tests are a definite step in the right direction.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

LILLIAN B. LAWLER

Stage Antiquities of the Greeks and Romans and their Influence. By JAMES TURNEY ALLEN. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927. Pp. 206. \$2.00.

One of our most eminent authorities on the ancient theater gives us here a brief history of dramatic production and stage-buildings throughout antiquity and in later times so far as the classical influence persists — everything about "the stage" except the literature itself, though he of course refers continually to it. No one who has not attempted a task of that type realizes its difficulty: to indicate the lines of development, to retain perspective, to be brief, clear, and readable all at once. Professor Allen has achieved notable success. Great learning, constantly governed by a sense of spiritual and aesthetic values, has produced a handbook sound, illuminating, and delightful.

Naturally few readers will agree with everything here propounded.

Professor Allen suspends judgment (p. 126) as to the date of the *Rhesus*, and I wish he could have accepted Mr. W. H. Porter's admirable discussion, in which I think early Euripidean authorship is proved. The account of tragic masks, etc. (pp. 144-8), is excellent, but some remarks as to the effect of masks on acting, and even on dramatic composition (cf. *Soph. El.* 1296 ff.), would have been useful. The silence of Pylades in the *Orestes* (p. 136) is better explained in Verrall's *Four Plays of Euripides* (p. 255). A notable omission from the bibliography is Zielinski's *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*. On the other side, I have space for only a few of the attractive notes that pleased me especially: the *deus ex machina* in *Tartuffe* (p. 117), some acute remarks on the coryphaeus (p. 127), the note about "deuteragonist" and "tritagonist" (pp. 138 f.), examples of the unities in modern drama (p. 173; he might have added Mr. Shaw's amiable and absurd preface to *Getting Married*). The illustrations are admirable: especially welcome is the account and the picture of Palladio's famous Vitruvian theater at Vicenza.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

GILBERT NORWOOD

The Roman Campagna in Classical Times. By THOMAS ASHBY, D. Litt. New York: The Macmillan Company.

In the 256 pages of this book, with its detailed map and 48 choice illustrations, most of them from excellent photos by the author and all of them unhackneyed, Dr. Ashby gives us first a General Introduction, and then, in five chapters entitled "The Roads Leading to the Sabine Country and the Apennines," "The Roads Leading to the Alban Hills and the South-East," "The Roads Leading to the Sea-Coast," "The Roads Leading into Etruria," and "The Roads Leading to the North," systematically explores from the gates of the city to their emergence from the Campagna the thirteen main-travelled highways of ancient classical Rome.

It hardly need be said that the appearance of a work bearing this title and containing these chapter-heads is exceedingly welcome to students of Rome in general, and in particular to the many American students, teachers, and cultivated listeners who have made the acquaintance of Dr. Ashby through special lectures in the British and American Schools in Rome and before branch societies of the Archaeological Institute of America. It hardly need be said also that

no one will think of calling into question in matters of fact the authority of a scholar whose whole career as student and director in the British School has been identified with exploration in the Roman Campagna.

That *The Roman Campagna in Classical Times* is from a hand so careful and authoritative makes it the more a matter of regret to find in its pages such examples of untidiness as *Clustumina* (30), *Tiber* for *Tibur* (113), *Aquae Claudia* (119), *part* for *port* (218), *Lunghezza* for *Lunghezza* (254), *Saza* for *Saxa* (256). We have *Hülse* and *Hulsen* on the same page (71); *Pignattara*, *Pignatarra*, and *Pignattarda* (146, 254, 256); *ad duas Lauros* and *ad duos Lauros* (131, 146, 253); *Gulf of Lions* (246). Other disfigurements not quite so clearly due to carelessness are *Paisello* for *Paisiello* (60), *Amphiarus* (113), and the statement that in Domine Quo Vadis the "imprint of Our Lord's footsteps (as is believed) is still preserved." In so vital a matter as the last, one should not be misled: the *real* imprint, according to the custodian of Domine Quo Vadis herself, is in San Sebastiano. The reader sensitive to word and phrase will be offended also by a scattering of linguistic blemishes: "would have had to have been" (188); the Via Aurelia "has a good many ups and downs, attenuated to some extent by cuttings through the hills" (226) — and it is exasperating to have one more scholar of repute contributing to the ambiguous and slovenly expression, "Aurelian Wall."

To these observations it must be added that readers looking for the charm and inspiration of an area so famous and so rich in historical and literary memories will be disappointed at finding the tone and content of Dr. Ashby's work so prevailingly matter-of-fact. In by far the greater part of it the author seems to assume that his reader will be an investigator wishing to walk the book out and verify it. We are given measurements in both metres and feet, and directions are given in degrees of variation from the cardinal points. Nor may it be said in reply that this is exclusively a scholars' book and that its purpose begins and ends in statement of fact. A book printed and advertised for the general public, abundantly and beautifully illustrated, and displaying in its first pages more than one scarlet, or purple, or at least pinkish, patch, can hardly be called unambitious to please the non-technical reader and immune to general criticism. Clio the Cataloguer of Roads would be Clio the Muse if she could.

These are not mere faultfindings, but the natural reaction of the classicist and humanist to errors of form and unevenness of execution in a work so nearly related to classical humanism. Classical scholarship takes infinite pains to guard against mistake or inaccuracy in matters of fact, and is justly merciless in their condemnation. Quite the same energy should be expended in avoiding sins against form and in making sure the communication of the maximum significance of the fact.

Dr. Ashby's work is at present, and will probably be for long, the best book in any language on the Roman Campagna in classical times; but readers who wish to realize the import and feel the spell as well as to know the facts of the vast and lonely plain that encircles the city of the Caesars will have to call in further aid.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

GRANT SHOWERMAN

The Classical Tradition in Poetry. By GILBERT MURRAY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

The isolated college professor in the Middle West has occasion to rejoice that Harvard University has ample funds to bring to the shores of America the more brilliant European scholars, and afterwards to publish their utterances on important matters.

In 1925 Gilbert Murray was invited to deliver the first series of lectures in the chair of poetry, newly established at Harvard to honor the memory of Charles Eliot Norton. The lecturer chose as his general subject *The Classical Tradition in Poetry*.

In the first lecture he asks the question: What is meant by tradition? and answers it by tracing Milton's indebtedness to his classical sources. Any student who is majoring in English and wishes to know why he should be familiar with the Greek and Latin classics will do well to read this chapter.

The second chapter deals with the "Molpe," the dance and song that preceded the existing forms of Greek poetry. It is full of interesting conjecture about the feelings of primitive men, but there are pitfalls for the unwary who may accept as fact what Professor Murray only meant for a guess in the dark. The end of the chapter discusses the conditions of poetic inspiration and makes a fair attempt to reconcile the theory of poetic inspiration with Horace's prescription, *limae labor*.

In the third lecture Cornford's theory of the origin of comedy and tragedy is accepted without qualification. *Katharsis* is discussed in the light of Freud. We find delight in comedy because our stone-age ancestors were polygamous and anarchistic. Falling in love with the heroine on the stage, and submerging ourselves for an hour or two in the rascalities of stage tricksters, we open a safety valve and allow the steam to escape that otherwise might work us harm. This is hardly convincing even to those who are willing to admit that Freud may be of service in helping us to understand what Aristotle meant by *Katharsis*. In the latter half of the chapter a more successful attempt is made to explain why we enjoy tragedy, and serious students of the drama will find it well worth their attention.

The lecture on "Metre" includes the many acute observations which we should naturally expect from one who has achieved some distinction as a writer of English verse. While obviously it was not written for an audience of specialists in meter, it contains many useful suggestions for careful students of English metrics.

The fifth lecture, on "Poetic Diction," opens with an argument in support of Aristotle's dictum that there are such things as poetic words, that are not the words of ordinary prose. The lines chosen to support the argument — the opening of the second book of *Paradise Lost* — are not altogether a happy selection. Here Wordsworth might well say that all the words which Milton used, with the exception of "Ormus" and "Ind" are words of everyday speech, and that the lines owe their majesty to the poet's masterful collocation. Indeed we could easily conceive that Mr. Babbit might use "high," "throne," "royal," "state," "outshone," "wealth," "exalted," in one of his oratorical effusions; but we could not conceive of his writing Milton's lines. Again Professor Murray uses an unconvincing argument against Wordsworth's theory when he suggests the substitution of the clause "dies the duck" in Tennyson's lines:

Man comes and tills the field and lies beneath,
And after many a summer dies the swan.

"Duck" and "swan" are both words that men use in common speech. It would have been more to the point if he had suggested the substitution of "plows" for "tills." Such a substitution would have met the requirements of Wordsworth's theory and would not have left the line "ridiculous." Of course it must be admitted that there

are poetic words that are not the words of common speech; but it must also be conceded that the more of them a poet uses, the more likely he is to pass the comprehension of the average man, who may have poetic feeling, even if he does not have an extensive vocabulary. The main part of the lecture, however, is devoted to a demolition of the stronghold of the realist, and to that the reviewer has no objection, although the topic can hardly be regarded as a subdivision of Poetic Diction.

In his lecture on "Unity and Construction" our author interprets the *praxis* of Aristotle and takes a fling at gargoyles and the other incongruities of Gothic art. While recognizing the justice of Aristotle's demand that in every artistic creation the part shall be subservient to the whole, one cannot refrain from observing that Professor Murray himself in the structure of his lectures occasionally introduces a gargoyle and is rather fond of building little Gothic porticoes which we should be loath to lose.

In the seventh lecture, which deals with "The Heroic Age," it is pointed out that "a past well dated and documented is always inconvenient" and sets restrictions on the poet's "freedom to invent and imagine." It is further suggested that our complex present offers less opportunity for the heroic virtues of courage, wisdom, temperance, justice, to display themselves. This may be questioned. It may also be questioned whether Christianity, which lays heavy emphasis on these four pagan virtues and has made them current in the minds of a much larger portion of the human race, has tended to stifle the creative impulse and high poetic inspiration, as our lecturer would have us believe. Ecclesiasticism may have been, and Fundamentalism may be, a suffocating influence, but this can hardly be said of the parables of Jesus. It is much safer to say that the great creative artist in the drama or the epic is a gift which Providence vouchsafes to mankind only at great intervals of time. When we remember that the Britons were living in wattled huts and painting their faces with woad when Christ was born, we ought not to be discouraged in the thought that England has produced only one Shakespeare and one Milton.

A first reading of the lecture on "Hamlet and Orestes" leaves the reader quite convinced that these two tragic heroes some thousands of years ago were one and the same person — a primitive winter god who slew the vegetation god of summer. But a second reading does

not leave the reader quite so sure. There are too many factors that we do not know. The ethics and etiquette of the palaeolithic and early neolithic family are still a matter of much uncertainty. It is a reasonable conjecture that the palaeolithic *paterfamilias* may often have been murdered by some young and powerful Aegisthus with or without the connivance of a Clytemnestra whom he afterwards held as his wife. It also seems reasonable to believe that a rigorous exercise of *patria potestas* may eventually have brought death to many a cave man when he was dropping into senility. In Hesiod the overthrow of Ouranos and Kronos by their sons may be a projection of such human tragedies. In those days when human sacrifice was a common thing, occasionally there may have arisen a Clytemnestra to avenge the slaying of a daughter. No doubt an Orestes often had reason to avenge a father's death. At all events we are not compelled to believe that winter destroying summer was the only form of murder known to primitive society, or that the procession of the seasons was the only experience which prepared the subconscious mind of the race for the creation and enjoyment of the tragic drama. And yet Professor Murray may be right. All forms of homicide may have contributed their bit in helping to form a rude ritual drama in which a vegetation spirit was the tragic hero.

In his final chapter, on "Poetry," the lecturer takes the stand that the moral and the aesthetic are the same, and that beauty (τὸ καλόν) is the supreme objective of life. This beauty embraces both thought and act. And yet he repudiates Tennyson's dictum that "beauty is truth," partly, it would seem, because the poet very often "sees vividly and deeply, but not widely and judiciously," in other words because the poet is not always a synthetic philosopher. This is like complaining that the wood-carver who carved the choir stalls in Lincoln cathedral could not plan the cathedral as a whole. It may be urged that those same choir stalls with their carvings, if they are entirely appropriate to the structure of which they form a part, are truth, or at least such truth as the human mind is capable of attaining. And so the poet who, turning his back upon himself and fusing himself with some object or aspect of life which he loves, has learned its inner secret and has given that secret adequate expression by the use of chosen words appropriately arranged, may well be recognized as a herald of the truth, even though certain other aspects of life may be quite beyond his finding out.

In conclusion it is only fair to say that the reviewer has read each chapter in the book with profit and delight.

CHARLES N. SMILEY

CARLETON COLLEGE

Alt-Ithaka. By [WILHELM] DOERPFELD. München-Gräfelfing: Richard Uhde, 1927. Two Vols.

In these two large volumes Dr. Doerpfeld combines his studies of almost thirty years regarding the site of Homeric Ithaca.

The starting point for his theory is the description of Ithaca given by Odysseus at the feast in the palace of Alcinous. The first thing Odysseus says of his native island is that near it are many islands, Dulichium and Same and Zacynthus. This certainly gives the impression that Ithaca is one of a group of at least four islands, but the modern Ithaca is only one of three, Ithaca, Cephalonia, and Zante. Explanation for this fact of three instead of four has been found in the assumption that Dulichium and Same were parts of the island now known as Cephalonia. Doerpfeld believes that there must have been four separate islands and that we must look elsewhere for the fourth island.

Another thing Odysseus told the Phaeacians was that Ithaca lies toward the west, the other islands toward the east and the sun. Ithaca however lies due east of Cephalonia, hence some island of a different position must be sought for the home of Odysseus.

A third thing he said of his native island was that it is χαμαιλή, which means that it either lies low or lies near to the mainland. Neither seems to fit Ithaca, as that island gives the impression of being lofty, and it is not near the mainland, but out in the sea.

Other passages in the *Odyssey* are used against the claims of Ithaca to be the Homeric island, but these three points — there must be four islands, Ithaca must be to the west, and Ithaca must be χαμαιλή — are the real reasons for the author's rejection of modern Ithaca.

He had long formed the plan with Schliemann of excavating in Ithaca after the work at Mycenae and Troy had been finished, thus uncovering the three great Homeric centers. The early death of Schliemann threw the work on him alone. He went to this island without a doubt that it was the Homeric site, but all his efforts to find anything resembling the palace of Odysseus were in vain and he was much discouraged. While in this frame of mind he happened to stand

and look across the waters to Leucas and it flashed upon him that here was the fourth island, here was the island to the west, and here was the island that lay close to the mainland.

Leucas is not really an island, for it is connected with the mainland by a low and narrow isthmus, an isthmus that has again and again been made into a navigable channel, and an isthmus that has often been under water even without the help of man. There is certainly in any case no objection to calling Leucas an island, just as the Isthmus of Corinth did not keep the lower part of Greece from being called the Island of Pelops.

Having found the first three essentials in Leucas he began to explore and to survey and he soon found in Arkudi the needed island of Asteris, the place where the suitors sought to seize Telemachus on his return voyage; then he found the harbor where Odysseus was put on shore near the hut of the swineherd, and to his infinite delight learned that it was called Syvota Bay, which certainly looks like modern Greek for σιβώτης. He later discovered a spring which seemed like the spring near the Homeric palace, and when he asked its name he was sure the obliging natives were joking him, for they gave it the very name which was given to that spring in Homer, except they gave it in modern Greek. He found that the name they mentioned was the real one, and this was a great confirmation of his faith in Leucas.

His excavations uncovered scores of graves, walls of various sorts, also water-conduits, and these were of a sort to prove that a civilization flourished here contemporary with and similar to that found in Argolis. This civilization also was overthrown by the wave of invading Dorians.

He found that for many centuries there was one universal method of disposal of the bodies of the dead. They were burned in part, and what was left from the burning was buried in a small jar, urn, or grave. There was no complete incineration, except when the dead bodies were far from home. The Homeric Greeks by the mere fact that they were in a foreign field were forced to use a different method from that employed in Greece. The many graves excavated in Leucas confirm the theory, which he had already vaguely held, that the dead were always burned, but not incinerated, and then buried.

The difficulty found in the fact that Ithaca is the name of a neighboring island and that its right to that name had not been questioned

for almost three thousand years he meets as follows: Dulichium has lost its name and become Cephalonia because of the refugees who brought with them the name of their homeland, and all that is needed is a like assumption for Ithaca. The Dorians drove out of Ithaca the Achæan inhabitants, who fled to the island of Same and transferred to it the name of the island from which they had come. It was later that the Dorians gave the island they had seized the name by which it has long been known, Leucas. It is hardly to be denied that the change of name which we know took place in Cephalonia was also possible in the neighboring island.

These two volumes are wonderfully illustrated by full-page views, diagrams, surveys, maps, photographs — hundreds of them. One could learn little more by going to Ithaca or to Leucas, and the material for deciding the question is now within the reach of all. Everything is done with such accuracy and such clearness! I know of nothing to compare with it, except his own *Troy and Ilium* and his own *The Greek Theater*. If any other scholar has to his credit three works to compare with these three I have not seen them.

I do not overlook the fact that he has lost standing by having written *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, but in spite of that intellectual apostasy I recognize in him the most influential figure in modern classical scholarship. This even if the identification of Leucas with Ithaca shall have been finally rejected.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

JOHN A. SCOTT

Homer's Ithaca: A Vindication of Tradition. By SIR RENNELL RODD.

London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1927. Pp. 160.

Sir Rennell is an outstanding literary figure in his own right, has been for many years an English diplomat to the eastern Mediterranean, is a trained observer, and an enthusiastic student of Homer. He says of the *Odyssey*, "I have read it more often than any other book." And he told me that in forty years he had not failed to read all the Homeric poetry at least once in every twelve months.

This book is the result of a lengthy visit to Ithaca and the adjacent islands, a visit for the one purpose of testing the *Odyssey* on the spot.

He knows Homer as few men do, and he has also a feeling for poetry, a feeling which the author of *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus* painfully lacks; hence his judgment is of great value. His conclusion is as follows:

Ithaca, so at least it seems to me, fulfils all the requirements of the Homeric text, and I can hardly doubt that the author of the *Odyssey* had lived there for a time and had made himself familiar with the scene of action. We have to make some allowance for lack of geographical precision in one who was a poet and not a hydrographer. But in the main the accepted version presents fewer difficulties and demands less ingenuity of explanation than the revised version. The much criticized Homeric geography is even surprisingly correct.

Sir Rennell discusses the words spoken by Odysseus at the feast given by Alcinous and shows that they apply better to Ithaca than to Leucas. The missing fourth island he places not in Leucas but in one of the Echinades. He believes that this island, Dulichium, owed its importance, not to its own size, but to the fact that it controlled the adjacent shores and to the fact that it was a center of commerce, commerce not unmixed with piracy.

He finds in Ithaca caves, harbors, springs, mountains, grazing-lands, and everything exactly as they are described in Homer, but always described as seen through the eyes of the creative poet.

The author of this book is fitted by nature and by training to be an ideal witness in this matter, so that it is hard to believe that he can be wholly mistaken in the field of poetic interpretation, especially as he visited the scenes with no thesis to establish but is simply recording his actual impression.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

The Odyssey of Homer. Translated into English Prose. By ROBERT M. HILLER. Philadelphia: The Winston Company, 1927. \$0.80.

Here is a very handsome little volume containing a translation of the *Odyssey* into modern conversational English. It is intended for boys and girls too young to appreciate the dignified language of the better-known translations, but old enough to be interested in the story. The work is well done, and the author shows a knowledge of Homeric poetry and literature, but he makes no attempt to display it.

The book has an excellent glossary which gives the pronunciation of the Homeric proper names.

There is no doubt that the language of the *Odyssey* is very elevated and that the story is but a small part of the whole; hence I should prefer a language somewhat higher pitched than conversational English, for the original was never conversational Greek. However, this book is highly to be commended in spheres where the story and not

the tone of the *Odyssey* is the thing desired. This book is written in a far more dignified style than are the recent attempts to render the New Testament in the vernacular.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Many Minds. By MAURICE HUTTON. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927.

Most of the chapters in Principal Hutton's volume, *Many Minds*, were once used as popular lectures, and one of them had been delivered as many as fifty times before various communities of Ontario. The high intellectual level of the book bears eloquent testimony concerning the serious-mindedness of the average small-town audience in the vicinity of Toronto. We hasten to say that this series of discussions, while it might prove very acceptable to the audience that assembles to hear the Lowell Lectures in Boston, would hardly make suitable mental pabulum for the average Chautauqua gathering. This is not because there is not an abundance of wit and humor in the book, but because the wit and humor are in the fourth dimension and play upon certain things that in the main are unfamiliar to Mr. Babbitt. There are chapters on The Mind of Herodotus, Thucydides and History, Plato and Poetry, Francis Bacon, Kipling, Platonists and Aristotelians, Some Oxford Types, The Englishman: The Frenchman: The Roman: The Greek, Satire and Humor, Thought and Action, Quality and Equality, The Best Policy. It is the function of such a book not to furnish the reader with ultimate truth, but to stimulate him to review for himself the important matter that is under discussion. Judged by this standard the book is a success and deserves to be on the shelves of every college and university library.

CHARLES N. SMILEY

CARLETON COLLEGE

Recent Books

Compiled by HARRY M. HUBBELL, Yale University

- Aristotle. Selections.* Edited by W. D. ROSS. Oxford Univ. Press, 1928. Pp. 378. 7s. 6d.
- BRITISH MUSEUM. *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri.* Edited by H. J. M. MILNE. Oxford Univ. Press, 1928. 25s.
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain.* British Museum, fasc. 3, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities. By H. B. WALTERS. British Museum, 1928. 12s. 6d.
- DAVIS, A. H. *A Pioneer Latin "Unseen" Book and Historical Reader.* With Introduction and Vocabulary. Macmillan, 1928. Pp. 267. 2s.
- DENNIE, JOHN. *Rome of Today and Yesterday: The Pagan City.* Putnam, 1928. Pp. 406.
- Isaeus.* With an English Translation by EDWARD SEYMOUR FORSTER (Loeb Classical Library). Putnam, 1927. Pp. 503. \$2.50.
- LA PIANA, GEORGE. *Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Century of the Empire.* Harvard Univ. Press, 1928. Pp. 222. \$2.00.
- MATTINGLY, HAROLD. *Roman Coins from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire.* Methuen, 1928. Pp. 320. Ill. 21s.
- MEINERSMANN, BERNHARD. *Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den griechischen Papyri.* Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927. Pp. 124.
- Suetonius. C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Vespasianus.* Introduction and Commentary by A. W. BRAITHWAITE. Oxford Univ. Press, 1927. Pp. 94. \$1.50.
- TAYLOR, A. E. *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus.* Oxford Univ. Press, 1928. 42s.
- Virgil. Eclogues and Georgics. Selections.* Edited by E. N. GARDINER. Oxford Univ. Press, 1928. Pp. 144. 2s. 6d.
- Year's Work in Classical Studies (1926-27).* Edited by S. G. OWEN. Arrowsmith, 1928. Pp. 131. 3s. 6d.